

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1881.

ART. I.—DON JUAN OF AUSTRIA.

1. *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*. Edited by EUGENIO ALBERI. Serie I. vol. v.; Serie II. vol. ii. Florence, 1839.
2. *Antonio Perez et Philippe II*. Troisième Edition. A. MIGNET. Paris, 1854.
3. *Documentos Ineditos para la Historia de España*. A. M. NASARRETE. Madrid.

THE contemporary reports of the Venetian ambassadors to their Government furnish a picture of the awful period of earthquake and chaos which we call the sixteenth century, such as we never find in a stereotyped history of the old and formal school. They throw a light on that wild sea of passions which was let loose by the violent religious changes of the time, and where neither the rock of conscience nor the plank of decorum afforded a refuge. Yet the writings of the ambassadors, who were necessarily dependent on gossip for many of their details, and picked it up from all kinds of sources, must themselves be collated with the private correspondence of the personages of whom they treat, before we can be certain of arriving at the truth.

Since Venice, in the latter half of the sixteenth century, had more important dealings with Spain than with any other Christian nation, it follows that the reports of the ambassadors have done much towards illuminating the sombre and extraordinary character of Philip II. The evil influence which the time exercised even on those who were most thoroughly opposed to religious novelties, was nowhere more strikingly manifested than in this monarch, who combined, in an almost unique fashion, a vacillating timidity of disposition with a deep, quiet, and passive cruelty of heart. But as he was slow in all his thoughts and movements, so also

VOL. V.—NO. I. [*Third Series.*]

B

his character developed so tardily that even his father never knew all that was contained in it. Philip, when young, was considered a mild man; his pitiless severity was still hidden under the hesitating blandness which his timorous mind imparted to his speech; but that he was suspicious of those whom he was obliged to entrust with the management of affairs was evident even then. But a characteristic which we should never have expected to find in so cold and unimpulsive a nature, is his inconstancy. Inconstant he was to the last degree, ever ready to desert his friends at the first whisper of slander—a trait which caused Antonio Perez, in an absurd astrological enigma on his royal enemy, to place the first letter of his name in the “heaven of the moon.”

This peculiarity in Philip was nowhere more strikingly manifested than in his relations with his natural brother, Don Juan of Austria. It has been a common but surely a mistaken idea with writers on this period, that Philip from the first felt a vulgar envy of his brother, on account of his many brilliant and royal qualities. But Philip was too proud for such an envy. He, the King (*Yo, el Rey*) occupied a sphere far too exalted to admit sentiments of emulation with a subject. It was only when he began to believe that Don Juan aimed at entering that sacred sphere, that the affection with which Philip had formerly regarded him turned into hatred and distrust. For it seems clear that for many years Philip loved his brother well, though after a selfish fashion. Before he had ever seen Don Juan, he knew that a little half-brother of his, who was then hidden in a Spanish village, was likely to be the crowning glory of the House of Austria, and to serve him better perhaps than any other of his subjects. And from first to last he made use of Don Juan for his own ends, and persistently prevented him from becoming independent throughout his short career.

Never was a life more brilliant, more restless, more sadly extinguished—and, we may add, more instructive—than that brief course of thirty-one years; “a life,” as a modern writer truly remarks, “destined never to know the common-place.” Born at Ratisbon in 1547, of a Flemish girl named Barbara Blomberg,* the natural son of Charles V. spent the first seven

* Many and conflicting are the assertions as to the place of Don Juan's birth, and the status and nationality of his mother. After examining these, we are convinced, with Ranke, that Barbara was of Flemish race, and that her family was either noble or of the higher *bourgeoisie*; but the language of the codicil to Charles V.'s will makes it appear that the boy was born at Ratisbon in Bavaria. Strada gives 1545 as the date of his birth, and several of the Venetians mention 1546; but the irrefragable testimony of the Lepanto medal makes him twenty-four years of age in 1571.

years of his life in the family of a violin-player, in whose hands he had been placed by the Emperor's *valet de chambre* in 1550; but in 1553 he was transferred to the more suitable care of Colonel Luis Quixada and his saintly wife Madalena, who loved him as their own. As the Emperor was anxious to see him, his guardians brought him, in 1558, to Cuacos, near Yuste, where shocking traditions long lingered of raids on the orchards perpetrated by the future victor of Lepanto, and of the unaccommodating spirit in which they were looked on by the proprietor. Charles V. gazed with deep interest on the boy's fair face when he came to visit the Monastery, but avoided the slightest demonstration of the parental affection which he really felt.

In a codicil to his will the Emperor commanded his successor to "honour and cause to be honoured" the son whom he never recognized in his lifetime; and if he showed no vocation to the religious state, which was the one earnestly desired for him by his father, he was to receive from 30,000 to 40,000 ducats a year, and an estate in the kingdom of Naples. This last command the King never obeyed; but he even outstripped the Emperor's directions so far as the honour went. He publicly recognized his brother, and appointed him a household like that of the princes of the blood; he admitted him at ceremonies to the sacred shelter of his own baldacchino.* And now the world in general began to spoil, as much as it possibly could, the many good qualities which Juan possessed by nature, and which Doña Madalena had cultivated in the sylvan retreats of Villagarcia. From the time of his appearance at Court till the era of his government in Flanders, he was altogether raised out of his position by a universal tribute of admiration and popularity.

In addition to a sweet temper and a gracious manner he possessed all the fatal showy gifts which attract applause. The Venetian ambassadors speak in glowing terms of his lively wit, his beauty and grace, and his dexterity at every sort of manly and martial exercise. The idea of devoting to the priesthood a boy whose chief delight was in tilts and tourneys, and breaking in wild horses, early appeared ridiculous; nor did Philip try in any way to force Don Juan's inclinations in this respect. Rather was he rejoiced that he might keep so rare an intelligence for the secular service of his Crown. It was evident that Juan was intended for a high position, whether in the Church or in the world, and Spaniards of all classes went so far as to wish that he

* "Her portato soddisfazione e maraviglia a ciascuno . . . per la sua singolar bellezza e grazia, e per il vivo ingegno che tiene," &c. &c. Tiepolo, "Relazioni," S. I. vol. v. p. 75; also Sorango, p. 122.

might be declared next heir after Don Carlos, to the exclusion of the princes of Bohemia.* Thus early was he taught to look for a Crown, even one to which he had not a shadow of right. Philip, indeed, had no mind to see him raised to such an eminence; and sent for the Princes Rudolph and Ernest to Spain, for the purpose of familiarizing the Spaniards with their presence; but these German lads in no wise won the hearts of the nation from Don Juan, who was looked on as a Spaniard, and considered himself as one.

Even the ill-conditioned Don Carlos conceived a warm affection for this favourite of Nature and of fortune, a circumstance which assuredly reveals a vein of generosity in the character of the unhappy Prince. As to the young nobility, Juan was their "glass of fashion" and their "mould of form;" their idol, indeed, as they showed by trooping after him to Barcelona on the occasion of his attempted flight to Malta during the siege of 1565. This attempt, though made in direct opposition to Philip's orders, raised Don Juan very high in the opinion, not only of the martial youth of Spain, but of Philip himself, who welcomed him back to Court in the kindest manner; but it was not till two years later that he began to satisfy his brother's anxious desire for employment by giving him the post of Captain-General of the Sea.

It was very soon after this that Don Carlos endeavoured to persuade him to join in his own mad project of flight and rebellion. Juan, from first to last his brother's most loyal subject, resisted every temptation, and tried long, though unsuccessfully, to dissuade his nephew from his design. It is astonishing that any writer should have accepted the malicious account given by so noted a slanderer as Antonio Perez of the part played by Don Juan in this affair. Treachery, such as Perez himself practised, was utterly foreign to the frank and generous nature of this young Prince, who was the child of the North rather than of the South, and who, even at his worst, never condescended to the dishonourable diplomacy of his time. We find, on studying the narrative of the *huissier* of Don Carlos, and other authorities almost if not quite as trustworthy, that Don Juan was not even the first person to reveal the designs of Carlos to the King. The Prior of Atocha, to whom Carlos imparted, out of confession, his mortal hatred of his father, went to the Escorial on Innocents' Day to inform the King; and it was not till after that day that Philip, as we learn from the *huissier*, sent for Don Juan to the Escorial, where he asked him what had lately been the chief subjects of the Prince's conversation. Juan now told all, but not till he had exacted a promise

* Tiepolo, p. 75.

from the King to refrain from punishing Carlos, a promise from which Philip held himself released when news of the projected flight came to him from at least four different persons to whom the luckless Prince had revealed it.

Philip's love and esteem for his brother had now reached the highest point to which they ever attained; and in the following year, when the blunders of his two generals, Mondejar and Velez, had increased the Moorish insurrection in Granada to the proportions of a national danger, he determined to make trial of Don Juan's qualities by sending him as commander-in-chief to the rebellious province.

The post to which this youth of twenty-two years was now preferred was one calculated to try his temper and his obedience even more than his capacities as a general. It was very difficult in those days for a prince to make a good début in military life. The absurd ideas of the time as to the dignity of princes prevented their passing through the grades of the service, and yet the conduct of armies could not be entirely and absolutely entrusted to a novice. The consequence was, that a young man, even of Don Juan's spurious rank, appearing for the first time in nominal command of an army, was entirely hedged about by military advisers, and was unable to move of his own will; so that the army had in reality many heads instead of one, an arrangement specially impracticable in war. This was the case of Don Juan in the Granadino campaigns. It was Philip's constant practice to check his lieutenants by means of one another, a practice which originated in his suspicious temperament, and was a fruitful cause of the failures of his reign. On this occasion Philip not only surrounded his brother with counsellors, without whose consent he was to decide on no measures and sign no order, but, most characteristically, took care that these counsellors should all disagree among themselves. The Marquis of los Velez and the Duke of Sesa, though uncle and nephew, were cold friends. The Marquis of Mondejar had an old feud with Sesa, and another with Velez; Sesa and Quixada, who was to be his ward's chief adviser, often combined against the Marquises. President Deza, indeed, made common cause with Velez, and by his interest at Court obliged Don Juan and Mondejar to expel the Moorish inhabitants of the city of Granada, although they had voted for allowing them to remain.

Thus Philip provided for the continuance of the insurrection, and looked wisely on from Madrid, while his two elderly generals, Mondejar and Velez, spun the war out, and gave the enemy every advantage in the mountains and on the Vega. In the meantime Don Juan was shut up in Granada and forbidden to issue thence. His ardour found vent in daring feats

performed during sorties of the garrison, for Velez so managed matters that the enemy came up to the very gates of the city. Philip gravely reminded his brother that the general ought not to perform the office of the private soldier, nor the soldier that of the general; but Juan persisted in the cavalry charges until Philip accorded to him the much-desired permission to take charge of the mountain campaign in person. The war thenceforth assumed a different complexion. If Don Juan was not precisely a genius, he was all that is intended by the word clever. He had good sense, a ready wit, and the quickest possible perception of surrounding circumstances and their bearing on each other; thus he was formed to be a successful general and an acute politician. On this occasion he was hampered by the usual clumsy nature of Spanish military and pecuniary arrangements, and by the rawness of his troops. Sigismondo Cavalli, who was Venetian Ambassador in Spain in the year 1470, blames Philip's ministers for trying to constrain the Moriscos by unwelcome laws before preparing the means of coercion; so that when the insurrection broke out, the Government had to rely on raw levies hastily raised, with results which showed how little new soldiers on their own ground were to be confided in.* They frequently ran away, and Don Juan twice nearly lost his life in rallying them: on one of these occasions Luis Quixada received his mortal wound. Nevertheless, Don Juan succeeded in quelling the rebellion, chiefly with the co-operation of the Duke of Sesa, who was a very fair general, and whom he liked, and Philip disliked, because he was also an open-hearted spendthrift man. During this war occurred the only instance in which Don Juan can be accused of cruelty, and that was at the taking of Galera, when he gave his troops leave to massacre the whole male population. Yet we cannot, perhaps, expect to find him always and consistently in advance of his times. Shakspeare, in "*Henry V.*," makes a king whom he intends to represent as just and good, threaten the same and worse punishments against Harfleur, if it persisted in holding out; and Shakspeare, in his historical plays, always paints the manners of his own times, not of those whence he derives his incidents. In general, Don Juan showed himself to be much before his age in the qualities of mercy and clemency, and also of honour, for he scrupulously observed the terms which he made with the vanquished Moriscos and their foreign allies, almost at the very time when Alva was breaking his faith with all the Dutch towns which capitulated, and English lord deputies violating all their pledges in Ireland.

* "*Rel.*," S. I. vol. ii. p. 166.

The Morisco war, though it exposed the fatal weaknesses of Spain more than anything else which occurred till the end of the century, established the fame of Philip's young half-brother, and also his own good opinion of himself; he was now ready to lead any and every enterprise, and the whole youth of Catholic Europe was eager to follow. Philip also had made use of Juan's capacity to serve him, and decided that he was a valuable machine for leading armies and sustaining the greatness of the Spanish name. More than that the King resolved that he should never be. The letters which Philip wrote to Don Juan at this period are very pleasant to read; full of fatherly kindness, useful counsel, and gentle reproaches because he exposed his life in battle. "You ought not to risk what would give me so much pain as any evil happening to you;"* "I advise you as one who loves you, and who desires that you may approve yourself in all things as the son of our father."† Such are the terms in which the king addressed his brother in 1569 and 1570. The answers, which may be found among "*Navarrete's Documentos Ineditos*," at once quaint, graphic, and ill-composed beyond description, reveal an increasing pride and love of power, broken by occasional fits of child-like diffidence. They are altogether the production of a clever, vain, inconsistent, and extraordinarily sensitive mind, such as Don Juan's undoubtedly was.

M. Mignet and Professor Ranke have taken different views of this remarkable character, and, like the knights quarrelling about the statue, both are right, but neither sees the other side. Mignet sees only the "naïveté and magnanimity," the amiable temper incapable of rancour or of spite, the honourable observance of promises and treaties, the stainless loyalty of the victor of Lepanto; Ranke sees chiefly the boundless vanity, the incessant longing for pre-eminence and power, the sudden outbursts of hasty and foolish talk, the pride and boastfulness which grew upon Don Juan when in the full tide of his glory, and which the world did its best to foster by flattering him to excess. In any point of view, his lively spirits, his inexhaustible wit, his graceful presence and personal beauty, make up a singularly charming exterior, but they were the principal cause of his many faults and failings. He went forth young into the perils of a stirring and gorgeous existence. He was so generous and gracious, so all-accomplished, so dexterous in what he undertook, that incense was burnt before him everywhere. His finely chiselled features, dark blue eyes, and golden hair brushed up from a broad white brow, were the admiration of all beholders.

* "*Documentos Ineditos para la Historia de España*," vol. xxviii. p. 52.

† *Ibid.* p. 64.

Ladies flattered him outrageously; men copied him as best they might. No wonder his head was turned, especially after he had won the greatest victory of modern times. But with all this splendour there was a curse at work which prevented his achieving success in life, a blighting power which he did not discern, though he felt its presence continually.

No portion of history is better known, as far as outward events go, than the formation of the Holy League against the Turks, the choice of Don Juan as its captain-general, the victory of Lepanto, and the disgraceful peace concluded by Venice eighteen months later; but the manœuvres of Philip during this period—manœuvres which were directed to unworthy objects, and which gave Venice some excuse for breaking the treaty of the League—have not, perhaps, attracted much attention. It was certainly an object with Philip to prevent the Turks from flooding Western Christendom; but it was almost equally his object to avoid crushing down their power entirely, and this for a twofold reason: he did not wish Venice to be too strong in the Levant, and he was determined that his brother should not gain an independent State, an event which he might not be able to hinder if Don Juan won too many victories. Philip only restrained himself from prohibiting a pitched battle with the Turks in 1571, because he never dared to give a direct answer; and he set counsellors around his brother, whose secret instructions, as we have no doubt, directed them to prevent him by all possible means from carrying his arms too far. Chief among these councillors was Giovan Andrea Doria, the sea condottiere, whose ships, hired by Philip for gold, were better far than Philip's own. There was no family in Italy more entirely wedded to the interests of the Spanish King than the Dorias. Ever since old Andrea had deserted France for Spain at the siege of Naples in the beginning of the century, the house had been at the devotion, first of Charles, and then of Philip. And now Philip found in Giovan Andrea and his cousin Antonio exactly the sort of cog-wheels that he wanted to check his brother's victorious career in the Levant.

In the "*Archivico Storico Italiano*" there is a rare old paper,* written by a contemporary named Antonio Longo, on the war and peace of Venice with the Turk. Longo, it is true, speaks with a Venetian's hatred of Genoese and Spaniards, but so many of his accusations against the policy of "Philip's Ministers," and the actions of Doria, are borne out by other accounts, that they are not to be put lightly aside. He considers that Doria,

* *Successa della Guerra Gatta con Selim Sultano*, "*Arch. Stor. Ital.*," tom. iv. part ii. p. 11, *et seq.*

whom he calls a corsair and not a soldier, dreaded the utter overthrow of the Turkish naval power lest his own occupation should be gone; and no one disputes the fact that Doria was disposed all along to prevent a pitched battle from taking place in 1571. With the mighty crescent of Islam full in view, he sent a messenger to Don Juan, urging him to hold a council before he ventured to fight; when the Captain-General returned the memorable answer, that the time was one for action, not for argument. It is true that Doria gave Don Juan very good advice as to the disposal of the battle, advice without which he might have lost it, since his own naval experience was confined to a chase after a few Barbary corsairs; for it is not to be supposed that Doria wished the combined fleets to be vanquished. But during the action Doria spread his own wing far out to sea, allowed Oehiali to damage the Papal squadron, and afterwards to escape from the scene of battle; and all this, according to Longo, Doria did of malice prepense. He also records that the saintly Pope reflected strongly on the conduct of the Genoese admiral, saying, "Dio gli perdoni, se lo merita."

Now among all the officers who served Philip on the day of Lepanto, Giovan Andrea was the one on whom the king bestowed the fullest praises and rewards. Of his slackness in showing honour to numerous gentlemen who had done great deeds on that day, Don Juan had to complain deeply in his own quaint half-jesting style. "They tell me I ought to send a person to Court who shall do nothing but cry to our master, 'Mercedes, Mercedes!'"* Thus he wrote to his friend, Ruy Gomez, feeling deeply the neglect shown by his King towards his valiant officers, some of whom told the young victor that they served for love of him, not of their Sovereign.† Yet when Doria went to Spain to visit Philip, the King presented him with gifts of honour, and attributed the victory greatly to his valour and prudence. Every circumstance seems to point to a collusion between the King and the Dorias at this time.

It was the proceedings of the year 1572 which gave the Venetians their best excuse for leaving the Holy League. Philip, threatened with a French war and a Flemish insurrection, commanded Don Juan to remain in Sicily with the Armada, contrary to the treaty of the League, which obliged all the fleets to *rendezvous* at Corfu in the middle of April. The Venetians were most indignant, and were instant with both the King and the Captain-General to fulfil their obligations. Alone of all Spaniards Juan was very popular among the Venetians, although he had disagreed with their cross old admiral, Veniero, the year before.

* "Doc. Ined.," vol. xxviii. p. 177.

† *Ibid.* p. 178.

Antonio Tiepolo, a sort of itinerant ambassador in the interests of the League, who had met Don Juan at Genoa in August, 1571, wrote to the Seigniory praising him in the warmest manner, and always maintained, very justly, that the battle of Lepanto would never have been fought but for "the valour of the Venetians, and the firm resolution of this generous youth."* Juan himself was exceedingly anxious to go to the Levant in the early summer of 1572. His private letters show that he really wished to act honourably towards Venice; moreover, the Greeks of the Morea wanted to have him for their king, and were already in insurrection against the Turk. No position in history could be grander than that of a sovereign who should have won his kingdom through his sword, not by conquering his people, but by delivering them, at their own earnest request, from the worst of foreign tyrannies. No wonder Juan longed to drive the Turks out of the Morea. But Philip knew of this glorious opportunity, and knew also how to spoil it.

Don Juan had obtained leave to send some galleys to the Levant, under Colonna, early in July, and in August Philip permitted him to follow in person. Giovan Andrea was not with him on this occasion, but he was directed to defer especially to the opinions of the Marquis of Santa Cruz and Antonio Doria. When he joined the Allies off the western coast of Greece, Ochiali, who had hastily constructed a fleet of about 200 galleys since Lepanto, fled before him into the harbour of Modon, where he huddled up his forces beneath the guns of the castle. All the Turks now cried out in despair that Ochiali had delivered his fleet, and Greece with it, into the enemy's hand; his very crews kept their shoes in their hands, ready to spring ashore when they should be attacked. They could hardly believe their senses when they found that they were not attacked at all. Don Juan's intention from the first, as we could show by his own letters,† was to destroy Ochiali in Modon harbour, having first thrown some troops on land and secured the castle; and Colonna and the Venetians were eager to take advantage of their opportunities. But the Marquis of Santa Cruz and Antonio Doria most urgently opposed Don Juan's plans, alleging several pusillanimous reasons for returning to Italy. Whether, in secret council, they gave other reasons, or adduced an absolute prohibition of an encounter on Philip's part, we cannot know; but we do know that Juan gave up the siege of Modon against his

* "Rel." I. vol. vi. p. 198.

† See his letter of Sept. 9 to Garcia de Toledo from Cumenizza, in which he says that the enemy is in Modon, and that he is going there to seek him, adding piously, "May God our Lord give us the victory." "Doc. Ined.," iii. p. 61.

better will and knowledge, and proceeded to invest Navarino Castle instead. And here another doubtful circumstance occurred. Alexander Farnese, Don Juan's nephew, schoolfellow, and dearest friend, who had supported the arguments of Santa Cruz as to Modon, now undertook the siege of Navarino, and blundered as he certainly never blundered again. Had he, too, been requested to check his beloved comrade's career in the East?

However this might be, both enterprises were given up, and the Armada returned home, having accomplished nothing. The Venetians were naturally most indignant; and Longo, although he suggests that the Spanish admirals were jealous of Don Juan's glory, includes him also in his angry strictures. He did not see, as we may now so easily, the bitter reproachful letters in which Don Juan himself bewailed the fruitlessness of the expedition. "I am the more vexed," he wrote to Ruy Gomez, "because I saw clearly enough how easily we might have so injured the enemy that he would long have been unable to raise his head."* Nevertheless, Don Juan, as Captain-General, was not blameless in the affair. If he saw clearly what ought to be done, he should not let himself be persuaded not to do it. He might have shown in 1572 as much determination as in 1571. But before Modon he was in a weak mood, and for the remarkable fluctuations of his temper and spirits no one was responsible except himself.

The Venetians took the opportunity of declaring that they could no longer sustain the fruitless expense of their Armada, and no doubt they were glad of the excuse. At the very time when the League was about to be concluded, they had made frantic efforts to bring the Turks to terms; and even early in 1572 they showed unbecoming and imprudent anxiety to effect a peace. The agreement which they made in 1573 would have been disgraceful if they had lost instead of winning a battle; and so callous had Venetian feeling grown, that one of their envoys, describing a saloon where he awaited the Grand Signior, observed in his report that the spoils of war, among them the stuffed skin of Bragadino, had been carried past these very windows.†

The Greek Crown having vanished, Juan, with the approbation of Gregory XIII., contemplated establishing a Christian monarchy at Tunis. Carthage was to be rebuilt under the patronage of Rome. But his usual ill-luck pursued him here also. Philip allowed him to conquer Tunis, but not to make it his own.‡ Philip was beginning to look on this restless youth

* From Sta. Maria de Vulla, Oct. 22, 1572.

† Costantina Garzoni, "Rel." III. vol. i. p. 379.

‡ M. Mignet, in "Antonio Perez et Philippe II.," shows, from evidence which may easily be found in the above-mentioned volumes of the "Docu-

as a somewhat dangerous person, for Philip could not comprehend that his honour set limits to his folly. It is wonderful, however, that the King did not perceive the prudence of allowing him a sovereignty in Tunis, which would preclude other and more inconvenient schemes.

Don Juan's two secretaries, Soto and Escovedo, who were in great part responsible for the excess of his ambition, had put it into his head to aim, in default of higher game, at the Vicariate-General of Italy, which would give him power and precedence over the different viceroys. Naturally the viceroys of Naples, where he always spent the winter, did not like him, and took every occasion of quarrelling with him; so that Philip sent him to live for several months at Vigevano, a quiet little town in Lombardy, where he would be out of the way of all viceroys, and also of the Neapolitans; for Philip was very naturally displeased at his extreme popularity in Naples. The nobles loved him for his courtesy, which contrasted strongly with the arrogance of Granvella and of Mondejar; the miserable people for his generosity and the efforts he frequently made to lighten their burdens. Both nobles and people went so far as to express a wish that their kingdom should be made over to him altogether.

Don Juan was quite incapable of taking a disloyal advantage of this popularity, but it turned his head completely. He talked of nothing but victories and martial enterprises; he flung away what money he had with a lavish hand, that he might appear splendid and munificent; he said he would kill himself if he knew of anyone in the world more desirous of honour and glory than he was. He dressed so magnificently that it was dazzling to behold him; and took pleasure in excelling in all things little and great.

Vain and ambitious as he had now become, Don Juan was never silly. He did not scorn to ask advice of those who were competent to give it, and he constantly tried to acquire knowledge of such things as were useful to him. Early in the morning he heard Mass, a practice which he never omitted, even at his worst; then he gave audience; then read and answered letters with his secretaries. He next received the visits of Spanish and Italian gentlemen, and gave more audiences till dinner-time. After dinner he often played at tennis for some hours; on other days he would shut himself up alone to study, even trying to improve his singular orthography.* He understood fortification

mentos," that Don Juan was not guilty of disobedience to Philip in building new fortifications at Tunis, since Philip left the matter to his judgment. But his satirical replies to Philip's pros and cons on the subject, though most amusing, are extremely imprudent. See "*Doc.*," vol. iii. p. 139.

* Girolamo Lippomano, "*Rel.*," S. II. vol. ii. p. 290 *et seq.* Lippomano, who is a terrible gossip, went on embassy to Don Juan at Naples in 1575.

and artillery better perhaps than any commander of his day, and was one of the first patrons of the breechloader, then newly invented.* The result of his keen observation of events was that he early became a first-rate politician, and, what was most wonderful considering the period at which he lived, he was also an honourable one. When it fell to his lot to compose the differences of the old and new nobles of Genoa, in 1575, he acted with a combination of firmness, gentleness, and good faith, which obtained the required end without bloodshed and without fraud, and calmed the fears of those who thought that, in his desire for power, he would be sure to seize on Genoa for his own. With Venice, notwithstanding her desertion of the League, he maintained good relations on his own account, well pleased that she recognized his importance by sending him an ambassador; and the Venetian envoy Lippomano observed to the Signiory that it would be as well to keep on friendly terms with Don Juan, who would very probably possess one of the Italian States after Philip's death.†

But in 1575, when Lippomano wrote these words, Don Juan had already set his heart on a domain far wider and grander than any Italian State.

In the year 1570, when Elizabeth of England and the Duke of Alva made up their differences on the subject of Alva's stolen treasure, and trade was resumed between England and Flanders, the Cardinal of Guise, uncle to the captive Queen of Scots, wrote to the Duke lamenting an amity which he considered prejudicial to his niece's interests. At the same time, in order to win Spain entirely to her cause, he sent articles for her marriage with Don Juan of Austria, which Alva greatly approved. This match was also preferred by the exiled countesses, Sir Francis Englefield, and the whole coterie at Bruges, to the alliance of the wavering Protestant, Norfolk. Philip, however, was entirely opposed to it, and the idea dropped for two or three years, when it was revived by Mary's cousin, the Duke of Guise.

Mary's sole chance of deliverance now lay in a foreign invasion, and for the obtaining of foreign help she relied entirely on Guise, who was the firm and faithful friend of his unfortunate cousin, and was always casting about for means to succour her. In Italy he and his brother Mayenne had formed a strong friendship with Don Juan, and conceived the idea of Mary's liberation by the valour of the victor of Lepanto, and subsequent marriage with him; a scheme which received the warm approval of Pope Gregory XIII., and was eagerly accepted by the Bishop of Ross. Don Juan himself, though he had cared but little for the sugges-

* "Doc. Ined," vol. xxviii. p. 266.

† State Papers.

tions of the English exiles in 1571, in 1574-5 gave willing ear to the proposal of the Pope and of Guise. It came at a critical moment, when the Turks had just taken Tunis, and when he had lost all hopes of a Mauritanian empire for ever, and was looking around wildly in every direction for Crowns. The Morea, Rhodes, Poland, Tunis, had successively faded from view, but to be King of England was grander than all. Philip, of course, was cold as to the project, and put it off, according to his custom, without explicitly rejecting it, when the Nuncio at Madrid asked for his consent and aid, but the idea had entered irremediably into the soul of Don Juan. Henceforth England and the English Crown were the subject of his dreams by day and by night.

In 1576 a momentous change occurred in the destinies of this most enterprising of young princes. Philip decided on sending him to govern the Low Countries. One reason for this resolution was that Juan was the son of a Flemish mother, and Philip hoped that the great name he enjoyed in Flanders, and his fascinating presence, might calm the awful tumult which Alva had stirred up. Another reason was that Philip thought it advisable to send his brother out of Italy, where the people adored him; for the cold-blooded burghers were not likely to be equally anxious to give him a Crown. This was the turning-point in Don Juan's life, nor is it possible altogether to regret that he was sent to Flanders. His soul, great and generous though it was, and always ready to turn into the right path, was fast succumbing to the evil influences around him. His vanity was rather increased than abated by the vexation which he felt at being twenty-nine years old, and still without a Crown; for every one repeated to him over and over again that he was born to be a king; every one forgot, as he pretended to do himself, that the bar sinister was a disadvantage. Now there was to be an end to all this. In the two years' purgatory to which he was doomed he was to receive insults instead of flattery, contempt instead of homage; stern reality was to replace the changeful mirage which had hitherto engrossed his gaze; misfortunes, many and great, but healthful and tonic, speedy death itself, awaited him in the dim northern land whence he derived his race, his vigour, and his courage.

Although Don Juan had previously expressed some desire to go and pacify Flanders,* he did not entirely relish the appointment when it came in 1576, probably because he divined its motive; but he was reconciled to it by the reflection that it would bring him nearer to England, the darling object of his hopes, and immediately told the King that the only true remedy for the ills of the Netherlands was to place England in the power

* Lippomano, 293.

of a person who was quite devoted to his Majesty.* He added that he really did not want the Crown himself, except so far as he might have it by Philip's favour, and as Philip's very humble servant; and then posted off to Madrid, against Philip's orders, with a double demand for the rank of Infant of Castile, and license to invade England. The King fled to the Escorial; but when his brother pursued him thither, he knew not how to refuse him utterly. He skilfully put off the question of rank; for the invasion he granted his permission, only stipulating that the troops were not to be sent away from the Netherlands by sea without the consent of the States. It is impossible not to suspect that Philip, in some roundabout way, gave the States an inkling of what was in the wind.

For this was the time when Philip was beginning to conceive the gravest suspicions against his brother. He and Antonio Perez discovered that Don Juan and Escovedo had been treating secretly with the Pope for bulls and money for the English expedition; an imprudence which was the beginning of all those terrible disasters described by M. Mignet in his striking volume on "*Antonio Perez et Philippe II.*" Moreover, Escovedo, before following his master to Flanders, sent in to Philip a paper on the subject of the invasion, couched in not very courteous terms; it even called the King's foreign policy, "*décousue*" (*descosida*). Philip had never had such things written to him before, and knew not what his brother might not do now when a secretary ventured to be so bold. But he was wrong, for Don Juan's ambition was limited by certain scruples, and fiery as his spirit was, its fire was harmless.

We have already described† the irritating fashion in which the States defeated Don Juan's project of sending the troops away by sea, and the manful regard to duty with which, notwithstanding this bitter disappointment, he set himself to achieve the primary object of his mission to the Low Countries, which was to pacify and save them to the Spanish Crown. His character and political opinions well fitted him for the task. He was always as much of a Liberal in politics as was consistent with veneration for royalty, and showed himself a friend and protector of the people wherever he went. He had disapproved of Alva's mode of "settling" the Netherlands, and was strongly in favour of restoring to the provinces and cities all the privileges of which they had been deprived. Nor does his private correspondence in any way bear out the accusation of his enemies, that, having

* "*Correspondance de Philippe II. sur les Affaires des Pays Bas.*" (Gachard), vol. iv. p. 167.

† In the first Article on "*Mr. Motley's Historical Works,*" in the *DUBLIN REVIEW* for April, 1878.

nothing but his sword and cloak, he was always urging the King to make war for the sake of the soldiers.* On the contrary, we find that he constantly tried negotiation before making war. He even proposed, in 1571, to secure Tunis by peaceful means if possible;† in the affair of Genoa he scrupulously avoided bloodshed; and so again now, he made every effort to meet the Flemings half-way, and save their country from the scourge of war. But he was in reality so heart-broken at the downfall of his hopes, that Escovedo expressed fears lest he should die of disappointment; in which case, wrote the faithful, foolish, adoring secretary, he himself would fly to his native mountains, and never see the Court or the world more.‡ Don Juan had inspired this man with a deep wild dog-like attachment; but, unfortunately, Escovedo had human imprudence and human ambition, which were luring his master to a lingering destruction and himself to a violent one.

Although the new Viceroy was unquestionably doing his duty, he was so far as yet from being resigned to his position that he made frantic endeavours to obtain his recall. Accustomed to the incense of flattery, he did not know how to take or to endure the insults which the States heaped on his head, or how to answer their outrageous demands. Both he and Escovedo confided all their hopes, their fears, and their anguish to Antonio Perez, one of Philip's Secretaries of State, and one whose persuasive manners and obsequious observance of Philip's character and wishes had raised him to great influence. He belonged to the more liberal and compromising party at Court, the party which Ruy Gomez had founded, and with which Don Juan had always identified himself. In reality, Perez was the very climax of the heartless cunning, the professed treachery, which were brought to perfection in the sixteenth century; but Don Juan was very far from divining his true character. With all his knowledge of Courts and ready perceptions, he failed to plumb the depths of dissimulation which yawned around him. Still very youthful in tone of thought, in tastes, and in appearance, at thirty he had not yet outgrown the folly of confidence in his friends. All his disgust at his present intolerable situation, all his grief at the postponement of the coronation at Westminster, were poured into the sympathizing bosom of Antonio Perez. "Oh, try above all things, to take me away from here, and I will be yours *in æternum*, if I can be more so than I am already." Thus wildly did he write to Perez, whose influence Escovedo also engaged to

* Lorenzo Priuli, "Rel.," S. I. vol. v. p. 270.

† Don Juan to Philip, Nov. 11, 1571. "Doc. Ined.," vol. iii. pp. 38, 39.

‡ Quoted in Antonio Perez, p. 42.

help in divers schemes which he thought would "look well in history." Among other strange designs, Don Juan thought of taking the Spanish troops into France, to fight the Huguenots on behalf of Henry III., his ancient rival when they were both lads and had both won victories. The plan was a wild one enough, but Escovedo observed to Perez, "You must not be astonished at anything which the Prince proposes under this blow, which has been too much for his spirit."

How entirely Don Juan had given himself up to the hope of conquering England, restoring religion in our country, and wearing the crown with which, as a scion of the White Rose, he conceived that he had some fantastic connection, was best shown by his wild despair when that hope was defeated. Philip, no doubt, experienced a grim satisfaction when he learned that the States had insisted on the Spanish troops going straight overland into Lombardy. Thither they went, albeit the plague was raging there; and the Netherlands paid, in the pestilence of 1578, for the obstinacy of 1577. But the sight of the squadrons departing, and leaving him alone and powerless among his foes, struck Don Juan with despair, which he and his secretary expressed to Perez in no measured terms, though in terms which contained no germ of treason.

All this time the much-trusted confidant was playing the part of a consummate traitor. Ever since Philip had been frightened by Escovedo's rudeness, and startled by the discovery of the secret negotiation with Rome, he had employed Perez to sound and worm out the designs of Don Juan and his crazy secretary. Perez even wrote to them of Philip in disrespectful terms, and showed Philip copies of the letters. What he discovered was certainly not high treason; yet Philip grew more and more alarmed in proportion as his brother planned enterprises and complained of his desperate situation. His project of taking the Spanish troops into France to fight the Huguenots was considered dangerous, and Perez has tried to make the world believe that the alliance of Don Juan with the Duke of Guise meant treason to their respective sovereigns, and that Guise concealed his friend's messengers in his cabinet, and treated with them secretly. This ridiculous charge M. Mignet has fully refuted by merely examining the correspondence of the time. Don Juan's special messengers went to Paris to raise money, with the full knowledge of Philip II.; and the schemes concocted by him and Guise were also well known to the King at this time, the Duke having made some very sensible remarks on the subject to Vargas the Spanish ambassador. "He thinks," wrote Vargas, "that your Majesty alone would have settled the Scottish affair long ago but for fear of the very Christian King, who would have

settled it himself but for fear of your Majesty; and he desires the 'union of the two Crowns,' and the consequences which will flow from this union."* But when once Philip had begun to suspect one of his subjects, his suspicions always intensified themselves day by day. He and Perez saw the wildest plots looming in the capacious horizon of Don Juan's imagination—one of them being an intention to marry Queen Elizabeth and to give her Flanders as a wedding present. They fancied that Elizabeth had sent him jewels, and that he had asked the Pope's permission to marry a heretic.† The whole story would be most ludicrous were it not so tragical. Don Juan was, in reality, serving Philip to the best of his abilities all this time; but Philip's former love for him had already changed to hate and distrust, when he committed the crowning error of sending Escovedo to Spain.

The secretary's mission was simply to impress on Philip the necessity of sending money and troops to the Netherlands, since Orange had already succeeded in destroying the good effects of the pacification of Ghent and the Perpetual Edict. But Philip, mad with suspicion, saw another motive for his coming. "We must get rid of him before he kills me," he wrote to Perez.

A circumstance which Philip considered as conclusively damnable was that Escovedo had proposed to fortify the rock of Mogro, off Santander, in his native Asturias, and to command it himself. That Don Juan, after taking possession of England, intended to land at Santander and conquer Spain, was thenceforth a certainty in Philip's idea. It was no longer a question of foreign Crowns—that of the Greeks, or of the African Moors, or of the Tudors; it was his own Crown that was aimed at—that very diadem of Spain itself to which a large party of the nobles, in Juan's boyhood, had wished him to be considered the heir-presumptive. Yet Philip felt himself obliged to dissimulate his enmity against his brother, and even to send the troops back to him from Italy, under command of the Prince of Parma, with which troops he made successful war on the States, winning the great victory of Gembloux in January, 1578. But then came another torrent of vehement anxious letters from Flanders, expressing solicitude for the King's affairs only, but containing what Philip regarded as dangerous demands for "money, more money, and Escovedo." The King was convinced now that there was no wickedness which his brother would not commit at Escovedo's instigation, and he resolved to smite in secret the author of so many treasons. Perez, in his "Memorial," says that the Marquis de los Velez, the head of his party, approved

* Quoted by M. Mignet, "Antonio Perez," p. 66.

† Cabrera, "Felipe Segundo," 971.

of this decision ; but it was Perez alone who afterwards bore the weight of the guilt.

Never was a more base and cowardly attack made by a sovereign on a subject than this murder of Escovedo, and at no time but the end of the sixteenth century could it have occurred. "L'ordre donné par un roi de faire tuer l'un de ses sujets," says M. Mignet, "pourrait sembler étrange, si l'on ne se souvenait des habitudes comme des théories de ce siècle violent, tout rempli de meurtres. La mort y était le dernier argument des croyances."* The worst feature of the case was, that Philip never thought of an open trial, to be followed by an open execution if Escovedo were found guilty: he was too much afraid of his brother to arraign the secretary before the Council. He took refuge in assassination. To this end he employed Perez. For a long time Perez, though playing a false game with Escovedo, tried to shield him from the King's anger; and Mignet, unlike Ranke, believes that he became his enemy on account of Escovedo's boldly expressed disapprobation of his intimacy with Princess Eboli. Whether this were so, or whether his sole object was to gain more power over Philip by making himself his partner in crime, Perez consented to arrange the assassination of his friend; and, after three clumsy attempts to poison him, had him stabbed in the street on the evening of the 30th of March.

In the meantime, Don Juan's success at Gemblonx aroused new hopes in the hearts of his friend the Duke of Guise, and of Mary Stewart. It has been said that Mary looked without much enthusiasm on the "enterprise of England;" but whatever her just appreciation of its difficulties, her own letters certainly show that she ended by building all her hopes on the scheme.† Unfortunately, Elizabeth was early informed of it; the bad luck which, as Norfolk has said, attended everything that was done for Mary, would have it that a courier who was crossing France with a letter of Don Juan's to King Philip on this very subject fell into the hands of a Huguenot troop. They sent the letter to Orange, who saw in it an instrument by which he might admirably serve his cause; he forwarded that unlucky letter, with the graceful handwriting and singular style of composition characteristic of the author, to the Queen of England.‡ Elizabeth was much startled. She remembered a remark which Don Juan had made early in 1577 to her envoy, to the effect that he hoped one day to go over to England and kiss her hand. That ironical,

* Quoted by Mignet in "Antonio Perez," p. 60.

† She did not, indeed, enter into any correspondence with Don Juan; the Duke of Guise and her agents acted as go-betweens.

‡ Lebanoff, tome v. pp. 1-7.

that audacious remark, then, meant more invasions for the sake of the Queen of Scots! Elizabeth and Burleigh at once removed Mary from Sheffield to Chatsworth, and determined to help Orange in their own secret, underhand, shabby way; and Walsingham began to consider that it might be as well to assassinate Don Juan.

He, nevertheless, was expected by Mary and by Guise to subdue the States so effectually as soon to be ready for a landing at Dover. Mary, after saying that she would prefer to remain a widow, betrayed much fear, in writing to the Cardinal of Guise, lest Catherine de Medici should break off her Spanish match, and also that of her little son with one of the Infantas;* and a month later she recommends the Duke of Guise to rely entirely on Don Juan's aid and energy.

Guise's plan, which received Don Juan's entire approval, and that of Mary also, was to land a French force in Scotland at the same time that the Spanish troops invaded England; and, singularly enough, the restless little Duke of Alençon, who was always quarrelling with the King and seeking out some independent employment, offered to join his forces with those of Guise.† Nothing in the policy of France at this time is more singular than the facility with which great personages could raise a rough kind of troops, not only without the King's consent, but against his will.‡ Mary instructed her cousin to confide his intentions to no one in Scotland, except the Earls of Argyle and Athol, and a few of their chiefest friends, lest the approaching landing should get wind; besides which, the Scots always did better when employed suddenly and unexpectedly than when allowed to cool by long deliberations.§

But at this very time, when Mary was warmest and most hopeful, Don Juan was growing cold on the subject of his once darling enterprise. He saw that the Low Countries required his every effort. So pressing were his duties there, that he had hardly a thought to spare for aught else. His brother sent him no money; he had sold all his own plate and jewels;|| and the Papal Nuncio, Mgr. de Sega, who came to Flanders with 50,000 crowns from the Pope for English purposes, was so moved with compassion that he gave them all to the war with the States. Then came the awful news of Escovedo's murder, closely following an amiable letter from the King, in which he promised to send the secretary back to Flanders immediately. And yet in

* Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, April 10, 1578, Labanoff, v. 23.

† Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, May 9, 1578, Labanoff, v. 36.

‡ See account of Alençon's excursion into Flanders, "Rel." S. I. v. iv. Labanoff, v. 37.

|| Octavio Gonzaga to Philip, "Nav. Doc.," t. l. p. 373.

this letter there is one passage which seems terribly equivocal when read by the light of events: "I will remember what he merits," wrote the King.*

Some letters of Don Juan's, very recently discovered, show how little he suspected Perez of being the cause of his beloved secretary's death, or what manner of man it was that he had made his confidant. Whether or no he guessed that his august brother was the original assassin will probably never be known. He was aware that his brother deeply suspected his loyalty; he was wounded by Philip's indecorous attempt at an independent negotiation with the States through M. de Selles. And yet Don Juan continued to devote himself, earnestly and exclusively, to Philip's work; and his dealings with Guise were now confined to a request that the Duke would keep the Huguenots occupied in France, so that they should not invade Flanders. Never did adversity operate a more beneficial change than in Don Juan at this time. Pressed by enemies on every side, doubted, almost abandoned, by his brother, and weak in health as he was, his character seemed suddenly to shake off all the faults which the too warm sun of his glory and prosperity had fostered, and to bloom out into saintly virtues. Now that the end was approaching, God showered down His graces in double measure on this soul which He had marked for His own, nor did it fail to correspond. Don Juan bore his trials with the firmest patience, fulfilling every duty, practising every virtue, with a single eye to the glory of God and the service of his ungrateful master. At this most critical moment Philip seemed to have abandoned his brother altogether. He seldom wrote to him, seldom sent him supplies, reinforcements never, urgently as they were required. He did not express his profound distrust of his unfortunate viceroy, but none the less he let it plainly appear. Don Juan's eyes were now fully opened to the vanity of the world. All had turned to dust and ashes, like fairy gold; he began to aim at a crown more glorious than any which he had coveted as yet. Always, in his most worldly days, he had preserved a chivalrous devotion to the Mother of God, and had worn in his morion a medal of her Immaculate Conception: now he determined that so soon as he should have saved Flanders he would retire to the heights of her holy mountain of Montserrat, and there serve a King who would never faithlessly abandon him as his earthly king had done.

In the meanwhile, Don Juan applied himself to expelling from his army the vices which had run riot there under the Duke of Alva and Reguesens, and succeeded so well that Cabrera says

* Quoted in "Antonio Perez," p. 95.

his lines resembled a monastery rather than a camp.* Notwithstanding his stringent rules, he was ardently beloved by his soldiers, who looked on him as their comrade and their friend. He shared all their hardships, sleeping in the trenches, and exposing himself to shot and shell, to wind and weather. In August, unable for want of men to do more than hold his ground, he encamped at Bouge, three miles from Namur. The plague was in the army, imported by the troops from Lombardy; dysentery and fevers raged there also. Don Juan's kindness to the sick knew no bounds. He tended them with his own hands, and took infinite pains that no man should die without the sacraments; he constantly followed the holy viaticum to the hospital as a guard of honour.† Everything he had was given away in alms to his suffering soldiers, and most of his time spent in providing for their needs.

Powerless as Don Juan now was against England, Burghley and Walsingham still deemed him dangerous. Walsingham went over in August to sound his intentions, under cover of mediating between him and the States; and the impression which Don Juan made on his enemy shows that all his misfortunes had not taken away his old charm of look and manner. "Never," wrote Sir Francis, "have I seen a gentleman for personage, speech, wit, and entertainment, comparable to him."‡ Almost at the same time, Walsingham had despatched one Ratcliffe to assassinate his paragon; but Ratcliffe lost courage, confessed all, and was granted his life by his intended victim.§

When, in this same month, the Duke of Alençon arrived at Mons with a fourth army, Don Juan remarked to the Prince of Parma that he thought Flanders might now be called well lost.|| Still he held on gallantly, and the last letter but one that he ever wrote to Philip expressed a calm resignation to the Divine will. "I wait patiently for what God shall send me," he said on the 12th of September.¶ It was deliverance from all his troubles that God was about to send him now. On the 16th he sickened of malignant fever, caught from his plague-stricken soldiers, and no sooner knew of what sort it was than he said that he should die. On the 20th he wrote his last letter to the King, "admirable," says M. Mignet, "for its elevation of sentiment, its eloquence, and its solid counsels." The composition, of course, is the work of a secretary, but the spirit is that of the dying hero. Don Juan assures Philip of his loyalty in the most pathetic

* Cabrera, 1007.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Letter to Burghley, in the Record Office, Aug. 27, 1578.

§ Ratcliffe seems to have been a natural son of the Earl of Sussex.

|| Lippomano, "Rel.," S. III. vol. iv. p. 39.

¶ "A que Dios menbiarré me remito." Quoted by Mignet, p. 102.

terms, and entreats him not to abandon the Low Countries to their fate. "Let me repeat for the last time," he wrote, "that if what I ask (supplies and reinforcements) be withheld, I shall not be responsible for the consequences that may follow. . . . It grieves me that I alone am disgraced and abandoned by your Majesty, since no one is so passionately devoted to you as I am. . . . If you let yourself be overcome by difficulties, you will certainly lose these countries, and perhaps the rest."* After this letter was despatched the fever increased in violence, and Don Juan hastened to receive the sacraments before delirium came on. It raged for about nine days, and left him conscious on the 1st of October, when he died full of contrition and of resignation, glad to seek a world where treachery and cruelty have no part. No end could be holier or more perfect. Alexander of Parma, who was with him to the last, always spoke of his young uncle as having died the death of a saint. The whole army mourned their commander with a heart-felt grief. The deep bell of Namur Cathedral, tolling through the deadly autumn air and across the sluggish waters of the Meuse, seemed to ring the last knell of earthly hopes and earthly glory.

Yet, sad as the extinction of that brilliant existence seems at first sight, it is impossible to regret that Juan endured the purgatory of Flanders. Few can doubt that that two years' anguish, that early death, ensured an eternity of joy. Much more than the victim, the two traitors at Madrid, who had brought about his destruction, are to be pitied. Philip, when he heard of his brother's illness, sent him a kind letter, full of affectionate expressions which cost little; but Don Juan was dead long before it was even written, and Alexander Farnese reigned in his stead. The suggestion made by many historians, that Don Juan was poisoned by order of the King, is absurd enough, since there was ample cause for his death without direct foul play; but Philip can hardly be held altogether guiltless in the matter. He had an indirect way of bringing about such tragedies. Ten years before, when Don Carlos was in prison, the King had told his counsellors that there was no need to take strong measures against the Prince, since he was killing himself by his excesses at table; which excesses Philip made not the smallest effort to restrain. He left circumstances to kill his son, neither hastening nor retarding them, and found the plan answer so well that he employed it on two or three subsequent occasions. This was one of them. He saw events in the Low Countries closing in around his brother; he left him there unsupported,

* Last letter of Don Juan to Philip, Sept. 20, 1578; quoted by Mignet in "Antonio Perez et Philippe II.," p. 103 *et seq.*

almost disowned, since he had tried even to negotiate with the States independently of his viceroy, and had offered to appoint another. Adverse circumstances pressed on Don Juan like converging fiery walls. Abandoned, disappointed, burdened with a task he had not means to fulfil, in failing health—there was no doubt what the end would be: Philip calmly watched it approaching, and when it came, retired decorously to the convent of San Hieronimo to mourn. And yet he had looked, and looked not in vain, to Don Juan's energy and talent to preserve a standing-ground for his authority in the Low Countries. He was warming his

fingers old
O'er the embers covered and cold
Of that most fiery spirit ere it fled;

and when it fled, he repaired, and more than repaired, the loss by employing in the same work the unrivalled genius of Alexander Farnese, whom he presently suspected of treason and doomed to slow destruction in precisely the same manner.

What long and fearful vengeance Philip took on Perez, the instrument of his unheard-of treason against two of his most loyal subjects, has been carefully described by M. Mignet, though, here again, he and Ranke are not of accord as to the motive of Philip in pursuing his accomplice so perseveringly. The disappearance of the wretched tools whom Perez had employed in the murder of Escovedo; his own imprisonment and torture; his seizure by the Inquisition on the ground of his having let fall certain blasphemous words in his despair;* his flight to Aragon and the protection afforded him by the Arragonese, whom Philip deprived of their privileges in consequence; his final escape out of Spain and weary exile, are well known to the students of history. Nor was Perez without his own vengeance. When living in France, secure but poverty-stricken, he employed his leisure in supplying Europe with scandal about Philip II., which was eagerly devoured. Burning with hatred against the master who had used him for wicked ends and then betrayed him, and anxious to justify himself in the eyes of the world, Perez employed his fertile invention in concocting all sorts of improbable stories against Philip; neither did he spare the memories of Don Juan and of Escovedo, his malignity towards his victims overstepping the bounds of the grave. It is a pity that his "Memorial" should be so frequently quoted as an authority, even by those who are well aware of his want of veracity and of the circumstances under which he wrote.

* M. Mignet omits the worst of these; Llorente gives them in vol. iii. of his "*Histoire de l'Inquisition*."

Sixteenth-century ethics were never better illustrated than in this double tragedy of Escovedo and Don Juan of Austria. Philip, of course, felt greatly relieved when it was over, and all the freer for great military enterprises now that he had lost one of his best generals. He was not at all ashamed; he covered up the harshness, of which, perhaps, he was hardly conscious, under the veil of pious resignation to his bereavement. "I have felt it, as you may imagine," he wrote to the Duke of Medina Sidonia; "but I give infinite thanks to God for having been pleased to accomplish His will in my affairs."* Yet this fearful hypocrite nearly fainted when he looked on the ghastly beauty of his brother's dead face; he turned away and would not look again. If that face haunted him in after-nights, none ever knew it, for Philip was not wont to acknowledge that he had done wrong. He still obeyed Charles V.'s injunctions to him, to do honour to his brother, by burying him in the royal crypt, near the grave of Don Carlos. The prophecy which that unfortunate Prince had made to his uncle when trying to shake his allegiance in 1567, that Philip would always check his career, had indeed come true; and now, after ten years' separation, the second victim came to seek at the side of the first a rest which neither cruel monarch nor treacherous friend can ever break.

ART. II.—THE BRAIN AND THE MIND.

The Brain as an Organ of Mind. By H. CHARLTON BASTIAN, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

WE hail with much satisfaction, and yet with not a little disappointment, the appearance of this somewhat long-expected addition to the "International Scientific Series" of works of which it forms the twenty-ninth volume. We hail its appearance with much satisfaction, because its author is a man exceptionally well qualified to represent, once for all, adequately and fully, the modern school of idealistic materialism in its dealings with the physiology of the nervous system. His M.A. degree at the London University was gained by his proficiency in modern philosophy, while his time, his studies, and his medical skill, have all been largely devoted to the investigation and treatment of nervous affections. An intimate friend and ardent admirer of Herbert Spencer and Professor Bain, an acquaintance of the late George

* Oct. 29, 1578. "Doc. Ined.," vol. xxvii. p. 214.

Henry Lewes, and a reverent disciple of the late John Stuart Mill, he may well be supposed to be thoroughly acquainted even with the unpublished opinions of those writers, and to have at his fingers' ends all that can be urged by the school with which he sympathizes against the objections of such as ourselves. Moreover, the author is a very able, earnest, and industrious man, who has already shown his power of representing his views as to other matters with great force and fulness. It was with much pleasurable anticipation, then, that we opened Dr. Bastian's thick octavo, hoping therein to find evidence of his having thoughtfully considered such objections as have been urged by men such as we are against other writers of his school, and to meet with fresh arguments which might put our mental powers somewhat on the stretch to refute them. Not slight, then, has been our disappointment to find that the only arguments which really tell against his system are by him utterly ignored; that the real difficulties which that system has to meet and explain are passed over in silence, and that, instead of the exciting pleasure of a real combat, we have but to record one more of the many instances in which assertion does duty for proof, and in which the innocent ignorance of the scientifically uncultured public is imposed upon by a parade of irrelevant knowledge, by a few foolish sneers, and by much empty declamation.

Why, then, it may be asked, take the trouble to review a work so little deserving serious attention? We reply, the work *does* deserve serious attention. In the first place, it contains a great deal of very interesting information, and many statements of facts, and many assertions with which it is desirable the Catholic reading public should be made acquainted. But the work also, and above all, deserves attention on account of its typical character. Let the reader once have a sufficient knowledge of this book and he will know all that can be said on the materialistic side, and, armed with a refutation and explanation of the views contended for by Dr. Bastian, he will be armed against modern materialism altogether. By learning what are the author's mistakes and misapprehensions, the reader may be prepared to look out for and appreciate the analogous mistakes and misapprehensions of the whole school of writers of which Dr. Bastian is one, and which vitiate all their arguments and stultify all their conclusions.

After so depreciating a commencement, it is especially incumbent upon us to do full justice to Dr. Bastian, and the best way to do so will be to give a full statement of the contents of his work, only dwelling on those parts of it which have an interest for us—on those parts, that is, which concern our great controversy with modern materialism.

The work occupies no less than seven hundred pages, its contents being arranged in thirty chapters; but, unfortunately, there is no preface, and no preparatory statement as to the general aim and objects of the work.

A very large portion of the book is taken up with an account of the nervous structures of the whole animal world, and the first chapter has for its title "The Uses and Origin of a Nervous System."

Exception may be taken to the author's very first sentence. He says: "A lifeless object makes no appreciable response to external impressions." Such an assertion seems strange in the face of the well-known phenomena of attraction and repulsion in magnetism and electricity. But, letting this pass, a much more important error vitiates his first hypothesis, that as to "the origin of a nervous system"—the very *fons et origo* of his whole biological philosophy. For, following in the footsteps of him who is amusingly called by the entirely unphilosophic Darwin "our great philosopher"—in the footsteps, that is, of Mr. Herbert Spencer—Dr. Bastian represents a nervous system as having been generated through the reiterated passage of an impression, or stimulus, along definite paths in some animal's body as yet possessing no nervous system at all. "Ultimately," he tells us, "by the constant repetition of such a process, we should have the gradual formation of an actual 'nerve fibre,'" and he brings forward as examples (of animals just caught, as it were, in this incipient nervous condition) certain medusæ, or jelly-fishes, which, while having no nervous system, have yet managed so to convey impressions and stimuli along definite lines so as to seem, for all the world, as if they had one. This discovery was made by Mr. Romanes, and his really very interesting experiments were detailed before the Royal Society, and subsequently a wider public, at the Royal Institution, was regaled with a lecture, in which the actual generation of a nervous system before our very eyes was pointed out. At this stage of scientific knowledge Dr. Bastian's first chapter was written and set up in type. But, alas! very shortly afterwards, Mr. Schäfer and Professor Hertwig both succeeded in discovering a most distinctly developed and, indeed, complex nervous system in these very creatures which were thought to have none, and whose singular movements (under Mr. Romanes's experiments) were supposed to show us a nervous system "in the making." It turns out that, after all, they really had all the time a very well developed nervous system. It ceases, therefore, to be a wonder that they should act as if they had one, and the whole experimental "verification" of Spencer's and Bastian's *à priori* views as to "the origin of a nervous system" falls to the ground. A small foot-note on p. 22

recognizes the fact of this discovery, but, as is not unnatural, the author does not point out its significance.

The second chapter treats of the *structure of nervous tissue*—its *fibres, cells, and ganglia*, and although such qualifying expressions as “it is thought,” or “supposed,” are employed, the impression conveyed to the general reader is that there is very little doubt but that fibres and cells are really connected together in the way commonly taught in textbooks. As to this sort of teaching, Mr. G. H. Lewes has said* these various supposed connections are “described with a precision and a confidence which induces the inexperienced reader to suppose that it is the transcript of actual observation.” Yet he declares them to be “imaginary from beginning to end,” adding that “no such course was ever demonstrated, but that at every stage the requisite facts of observation are either incomplete or contradictory.”

After a short chapter on *sense organs*, and six others describing the nervous system in different animals up to and including birds, comes one on *the scope of Mind*, which is not without interest for us, as herein Dr. Bastian strikes the keynote of his whole fugue, and presents us with a real *novelty*, as his views differ curiously from that of every other writer known to us as to what the word *Mind* should signify. He admits that that word is generally taken to denote the sum of our conscious states, but he contends (very reasonably) that there is a close affinity between nervous actions which are accompanied with consciousness and certain other nervous actions not ordinarily, or ever, so accompanied. We might expect, then, that he would employ the word “Mind” to denote nerve activity (*i.e.*, regard it as a synonym of “neurility”) a use of the word which would harmonize with the views of Herbert Spencer. But he presents us with a singularly bizarre conception. “Mind,” for Dr. Bastian, signifies *our conscious states together with the unconscious activity of certain parts of the nervous system*, while the unconscious activity of other parts of that system (the activity of parts even of the brain itself!) is declared by him to be “in no sense mental,” but, on the contrary, “purely physical,” the nervous motor activities being excluded by him.

The author indulges in the usual ignorant declamation against what he seems to regard as orthodox views. Thus he speaks (p. 138) of Mind being regarded as “a real and positive something, existing of and by itself,” and (p. 153) of philosophical writers who, not having emancipated themselves from the mere metaphysical doctrines concerning Mind, habitually regard it as

* “The Physical Basis of Mind,” p. 267.

an entity, and speak of "the Mind" using the Brain as its instrument.

We can assure Dr. Bastian that "orthodox views" are free from all such or any such absurdities, and entirely concur with the most advanced physiology. "Mind" is a term which denotes the rational soul energizing consciously with the help of nervous matter which it informs—as it informs the rest of the body. "Mind," as such, is therefore, *of course*, a mere abstraction, though a real activity of real being, just as the "soul of a living man" is a mere abstraction, since during life it and the body it informs are one inseparable unity.

The very word "soul" acts on men of Dr. Bastian's school like the touch of Ithuriel's spear. They rise and vehemently exclaim they know no such thing! But this protest is again the result of ignorance of our meaning. We, no more than they, have any knowledge of our "soul" as something distinct from our "body," but we know our soul ever and always when we know anything and in whatever we do. Our personal energy, our feelings, perceptions, and relations are our soul. These are, and therefore our soul is, the most certainly and intimately known of all things known by us. As to the existence of our body, we *might* doubt—our soul it is conceivable might be made to err in its judgments and perceptions, and so deceive us as to the body's existence—but as to the *soul's* existence, that is the one thing about which doubt, in a sane man who understands the question, is simply impossible. As Dr. Bastian himself admits, nothing whatever can be known except in terms of "Mind."

But, apart from this explanation, we altogether object to Dr. Bastian's use of the word "Mind," or to any use which would depart from that usage which he admits to be universal, in order that Mind may mean *the activity of part of the nervous system and certain portions of the brain, he cannot tell which, certain other parts of the brain acting, he cannot tell where, being excluded*. He says (p. 135) very truly:—

All that we know of Mind is derived (a), directly or by inference, from our own subjective states (*subjective psychology*), supplemented by (b) what we are able to infer from the words or other actions of our fellow-men and lower animals as to the possession by them of similar states (*objective psychology*), and (c) by what we are able to learn as to the dependence of these subjective states upon the activity of certain parts of our bodies and of the bodies of other animals (*neurology*), or the anatomy, physiology and pathology of nervous systems.

He deprecates (p. 140) exclusive trust in subjective psychology as follows:—

If we lean implicitly and exclusively upon these direct revelations of

consciousness, we must, as the history of philosophy has shown, inevitably commit ourselves to a system of universal scepticism, needing, as Hume proclaimed, a rejection of all grounds of certainty for our belief in an external world, in body, and, indeed, in Mind as an entity—leaving to each one of us a mere fleeting series of conscious states as representatives of the totality of existence.

This is an unconscious tribute of praise to Catholic philosophy which postulates as our ultimate grounds of knowledge—(1) the dicta of consciousness, (2) the intuitions of the intellect, and (3) the information derived through the senses.

The second of these, Dr. Bastian and the whole school of which he forms a part affect to disregard or reject, but at what cost his own words show. He tells us that the direct revelations of consciousness "are by each one of us invariably supplemented and modified, where necessary, by what we deem to be 'legitimate inferences.'" Yet how can we avoid that very "universal scepticism" which he justly deprecates unless we can trust our intellectual intuitions and unless we can be certain of the objective truth of logic.

He compares (p. 141) our knowledge of "Mind" with our knowledge of "magnetism." He admits, indeed, that there is a difference, "of fundamental importance," between our knowledge of the one and our knowledge of the other, but weakens the force of this admission by saying that this difference reposes "only" on the fact that our "very conscious states themselves" are included under the term Mind. Such a remark is like saying that the difference between one thing and another is "only" infinite.

He then labours (p. 142) very superfluously to prove that "evidence altogether fails to assure us of the existence of 'the Mind' as a self-existent entity," which is like labouring to prove that hydrogen does not exist in a free state as hydrogen in water.

"Mind," as has been already said, includes, according to Dr. Bastian, not only conscious acts, but also unconscious activity. He tells us (p. 143):—"One of the principal errors which the metaphysical conception of Mind as an entity entails is that 'mental phenomena' are supposed to be limited or bounded by the sphere of consciousness." "An unconscious mental process" is very like "a triangular circle," or "a pitch-dark luminosity;" but the climax of absurdity is reached when he tells us (p. 145) that "it seems almost certain that the greater part of our intellectual action proper (that is, cognition and thought, as opposed to sensation) consists of mere nerve actions with which no conscious states are associated"! And yet this very writer objects (p. 147) to any belief in "unconscious sensation."

What, it may be asked [he exclaims], is the nature of unconscious "sensation?" Language employed in this way seems to become

meaningless, and, in the writer's opinion, cannot be justified. If an impression receives none of our attention, that is only saying, in other words, that we are not conscious of it or do not feel it. In such a case we have no reasonable warrant for calling such an "impression" a "sensation." No excuse for such language appears to be found in the mere fact that there are different degrees or intensities of consciousness, and that nerve actions without feeling cannot be sharply separated from nerve actions which are accompanied by feeling.

Let the words "intellectual action *proper*" be introduced in the passage just quoted in lieu of the words "unconscious sensation," and the unreasonableness of Dr. Bastian's position becomes manifest.

The fact is, the author confounds true intellectual activity, of which consciousness is part of the essence (and which, as active in organized being, is mental "action"), with that unconscious cognitive faculty which exists in animals—their "unconscious neural psychosis." To this question, however, we shall return.

Supporting his argument in favour of unconscious mental action, he makes (p. 146) the following objection to the view here maintained :—

If we are [he says], as so many philosophers tell us, to regard the sphere of Mind as coextensive with the sphere of consciousness, we should find "Mind" reduced to a mere imperfect, disjointed, serial agglomeration of feelings and conscious states of various kinds—while the multitude of initial or intermediate nerve actions (which serve to bind those other nerve actions commonly associated with conscious correlatives into a complex continuous and coherent series) would have no claim to be included under this category.

This consequence does not seem very alarming to us. Why *should* they be so included? We do not so include them; but our own consciousness none the less sets us perfectly at rest as to any danger that our intellectual being will be broken up into disjointed fragments in consequence of such exclusion. We know very well our own continuous psychical unity, which is (to sane philosophers) a greater certainty than is the existence of any nerve actions at all, fully persuaded as we none the less are that such nerve actions do really take place in us.

As has been just said, Dr. Bastian is strongly opposed to a belief in "unconscious sensation." But though his objection to it is an objection which really tells against his own stronger belief in unconscious intellectual action *proper* (!), yet he really admits all that we who *do* believe in "unconscious sensations" can require, for he admits (p. 148) that "there may be nascent, ill-defined, or abortive *subjective sides** to many nerve actions. Now

* The italics here as elsewhere are ours.

an impression is made by an external object on the nervous sensitive structure of a living organism, and if that sensitive nervous structure duly reacts according to its nature, then there must be a sensation, even though the 'subjective side' be 'nascent, ill-defined, or abortive.'"

Dr. Bastian then goes on to defend that very peculiar view of Mind which is (so far as we know) exclusively his own—the view that it is the activity of certain parts, he cannot tell which—*i.e.*, of the brain and peripheral parts of the nervous system, certain undetermined other parts of both being excluded. This arbitrary exclusion from Mind of unknown nervous regions is the more unjustifiable, since he himself affirms (p. 151) that "the nervous system is really one and indivisible, so that if, with certain reservations, unconscious nerve actions occurring in the brain are to be regarded as 'mental phenomena,' we can find no halting-point short of including under the same category any unconscious nerve actions of a similar order, wheresoever they may occur."

Nevertheless, he excludes all the parts which minister to outgoing currents, and therefore to acts of will—"the functional results of outgoing currents," he tells us (p. 149), lying "wholly beyond the sphere of Mind." These outgoing currents "rouse in definite ways the activity of the highest 'motor centres' (the corpora striata and the cerebellum), and through them evoke the properly adjusted activity of lower motor combinations, so as to give rise to any movements that are 'desired,' or which are accustomed to appear in response to particular sensations or ideas" (p. 585).

Considering that Dr. Bastian has objected (as has just been pointed out) to the exclusion from "Mind" of the unconscious nerve actions which intervene between others which go with consciousness, it does certainly seem somewhat arbitrary to exclude from it nerve actions which aid "response to particular sensations or ideas."

To the objection that by grouping unconscious nerve actions with conscious states, as components of "Mind," he unites groups of phenomena of utter dissimilarity of nature, subject, and object, *Ego* and *non-Ego*, he replies (p. 149) by the following noteworthy remarks:—

This is an objection based upon our ignorance as to the exact genetic relation existing between subjective states and the bodily conditions (or nervous actions) on which they seem to be dependent. It is probably due to an equal extent to a temporary forgetfulness on the part of those who advance it, that we are as much in the dark as to the real nature of Motion as we are about the real mode of origin of Feeling. Motion, whether molecular or other, we know only by its effects upon us—that is, in terms of Feeling. Who, therefore, is to

declare that there *can* be no kinship between that which is the cause of Feeling and the molecular movements of certain nerve tissues, when, as to the cause of Feeling, knowledge other than that which comes from inference is, from the very nature of the problem, for us impossible, and when we confessedly know nothing concerning molecular movements other than what we can learn through Feeling.

This passage is an excellent example of that confusion of mind (due partly to prejudice, probably sucked in in the early days of intellectual nutrition) which besets our English idealistic-materialists, and makes them—in the case of this author, we are sure, unconsciously—

Palter with us in a double sense.

According to the philosophy Dr. Bastian follows, not merely "motions," but everything must be known by us in terms of "feeling" and nothing else. What, then, can "molecular movements of nerve tissues" really be? They cannot, by any consistent follower of his philosophy, be really believed to be what he implies them to be—namely, purely physical action of insentient material particles, for such things are simply inconceivable to such a man. An inevitable Nemesis always pursues the idealistic-materialist, and forces him to perform "hari-kari." But we who are not of that school, can thank God for having given us grace gratefully to recognize and make use of the intellectual faculties with which He has mercifully endowed us. We *are*, therefore, able to "declare that there *can* be no kinship between" feelings and "molecular movements of certain nerve tissues"—no identity of essential nature, that is, though nerve activity is no doubt the agent which produces feelings. But we have a further question to ask. Since we are "in the dark as to the real nature of motion," who can say that to explain "thought" by "molecular motion" would constitute any real explanation at all, even if it were not intrinsically absurd? Moreover, Dr. Bastian and his school talk glibly about "molecular motion," as if they had had personal experience of the "molecules," and as if their "motions" were as palpable as those of so many cricket-balls, instead of the whole thing being a mere working hypothesis, pregnant with philosophical difficulties and contradictions, and therefore very probably, what we believe it really to be, a baseless superstition.

In the next (eleventh) chapter the author treats of "reflex action and unconscious cognition." Therein he is guilty of that sophistical confusion of terms which has become so common. We mean the confusion produced by employing a word of high meaning in such a way that it shall include within it, as if properly its meaning, that which it only signifies by a more or less remote analogy.

Thus he speaks (p. 157) of "discrimination" as the root faculty of intelligence. Now "discrimination" is properly an attribute of intelligence; but the tide which heaps up the pebbles forming the Chesil bank may *analogically* be said to "discriminate," because it practically sorts out the pebbles according to their sizes and weights. He says (p. 164): "Most of us must be familiar with the fact that by the concentration of attention in certain directions, aided by voluntary efforts, we are capable of increasing our powers of discrimination in the range of either of the senses, and that each new acquirement renders possible other and more refined discriminations. But there is reason to believe that, even without conscious voluntary efforts, the same kind of progress (though more slowly) is capable of being brought about by the action upon the organism of all the varying influences by which it is surrounded." Here is a confusion which it is very difficult not to consider a deliberate one, and yet we are convinced it is only a blunder. In the passage just quoted, discrimination is at first used in its truly intellectual sense, as denoting our voluntary acts of attention; and immediately afterwards a physical effect produced without the intervention of intelligence is spoken of as being of "*the same kind*" as the former. It would be as rational to say that our author and a hogshead of Bordeaux are creations "*of the same kind*," because they are both capable of producing intellectual confusion.

Plenty of "discrimination" and abundant conscious intelligence are manifested by the ant and the bee, but such intelligence is not their *own* (save as the severing of a plank by a saw is the "act" of the "saw") but that of Him who imparted such powers to the forms implanted in the matter of the universe. He tells us (p. 167): "There goes on, as it were, an organization of 'intelligence' primarily of the organic or unconscious kind, which is the hidden cause of the purposive character displayed by so many movements." But "unconscious intelligence" is either an absurd (because self-contradictory) or else an incomplete expression. Its only real meaning denotes the action of an unconscious creature replete with the conscious intelligence of some other being. We have such unconscious intelligence in a calculating machine!

As an example of vague loose statements pretending to be explanatory when they are in no way really so, we may take the lengthy sentence which concludes the chapter (p. 167).^{*} It is as follows: "Organic processes of the same kind *possibly* constitute the basis or starting-point for *all* subsequent mental developments and *mental acquisitions*, even when in higher animals such processes become quickened, *in some further unknown manner*, under

* The italics are ours.

the directive influence of conscious efforts of gradually increasing distinctness." A "possible" action aided by an "unknown" activity will, we venture to think, hardly be accepted as elucidatory by any one who cares to analyze with a little care the dogmas propounded for our acceptance by idealistic-materialists.

The next (twelfth) chapter treats of "Sensation, Ideation, and Perception." As usual, the philosophers referred to are all of one school—namely, that of Descartes. We read of "Descartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and other philosophers," with references to Hamilton, Mansell, and others, *ejusdem generis*, as if their opinions were really of some extraordinary importance. Descartes, by his own confession, never studied the philosophy generally received before his time. In ignorance he struck out a new line of his own, and, brilliantly gifted as he was, most of the popular philosophers who came after him—all those with whom Dr. Bastian is apparently acquainted—have been induced to follow him like the famed "moutons de Panurge."

After affirming that on evolutionary principles neither sensation nor cognition can be supposed to be primary and to generate the other faculties, he yet favours the view that if either of these is to be regarded as primary, it is cognition. He favours it, since he tells us "that Hamilton '*truly*' observes—

The faculty of knowledge is certainly the first in order, inasmuch as it is the *conditio sine quâ non* of the others; and we are able to conceive a being possessed of the power of recognizing existence, and yet wholly void of all feeling of pain and pleasure, and of all powers of desire and volition. On the other hand, we are wholly unable to conceive a being possessed of feeling and desire, and, at the same time, without a knowledge of any object upon which his affections may be employed, and without a consciousness of these affections themselves.

It would appear, then, that Hamilton could not conceive of a new-born infant with pain in one of its limbs. He could not deny that the infant is capable of feeling, and he could not affirm that it has a knowledge either of pain as such or of its own organism. But Hamilton links "desire" with "feeling," and herein is ambiguous and misleading. If by "desire" he means the aspiration of a conscious intellectual nature, then by what he says he affirms that "we cannot have knowledge without having knowledge;" but if he means by "desire" an unconscious tendency (like that which leads the infant to initiate and continue the act of sucking, or a sea-anemone to close its tentacles over a desirable morsel) then we must further distinguish: If he means that for the existence of such desire an intellectual knowledge of the object and a self-consciousness of the affections experience is needed, then what he says is false; but if he means only such

organic discrimination as leads the salivary glands of a hungry man to secrete at the sight of food, and such consentience as leads a decapitated frog to assuage an irritation with one foot when prevented doing so with the other, then such "knowledge" and such "consciousness" may be freely conceded, with the remark that to employ such terms to denote such phenomena is either a folly or a perversity. But not only can we quite well conceive what Hamilton says he cannot, but we cannot conceive what Hamilton says he could, but which we are none the less convinced he could not. He has said: "We are able to conceive a being possessed of the powers of recognizing existence, and yet wholly void of all feeling of pain and pleasure, and of all powers of desire and volition." We can, indeed, conceive of a pure spirit, though we cannot of course imagine such an entity, having as yet had no personal experience of pure spirits. But we cannot conceive of an intellectual nature understanding things good and sensible in their due order, and yet perpetually abstaining from any act of volition. This second question, however, is not to our present purpose; we only mention it to point out what seem to us the errors and confusion contained in the short passage quoted, and because Dr. Bastian has made it his own by his epithet "*truly*."

But it is the more blameworthy of Dr. Bastian to adopt as his own this very unwise passage, because he has himself admitted (p. 148) that there may be actions of sense-organs which do not rise into consciousness, and if the action of a sense-organ is not a sensation—what is it? But he is yet more inconsistent, for he expressly tells us (p. 589) "a simple sensation can, in fact, scarcely exist in consciousness." Does it therefore *not exist at all*? But he evidently supposes that it does exist, and therefore, according to his then expressed declaration, we **MUST** have such a thing as *unconscious sensation*.

The whole of Dr. Bastian's reasoning about cognition and discrimination results from his own non-"discrimination" between, and non-"cognition" of, the meanings of words.

There are evidently three kinds of actions which need to be separately conceived of and separately named.

One kind is that self-conscious deliberate mental discrimination, or cognition, which we know may take place in ourselves, and which we may distinguish as *intellectual discrimination*, or intellectual cognition. Another kind is that unconscious indeliberate psychical and physical action which may take place in ourselves (as in automatically walking or playing the piano), and which also occurs in animals, through the due co-ordinating action in them (as in ourselves) of the nervous system. This kind may be distinguished as *sensuous discrimination*, or sensuous cognition.

The third kind is that unfelt discrimination which takes place in our own glands and tissues, and in the nutrition of our own nerves, which pervades the bodies of all animals and of all plants, and which leads a few of the latter to perform actions which simulate the sensuous discrimination of animals. This third kind of activity may be distinguished as *vegetal discrimination*, and of course it may be termed vegetal cognition, but to us it seems absurd to employ the word "cognition" to denote any activity so exceedingly remote from cognition true and proper.*

Dr. Bastian, however, does not scruple to call (p. 179) "mere organic discriminations," "cognitions," and to attribute therefore cognition to "plants," or even to "parts of animals," "in which it is not warrantable to assume the existence of anything like that which we know as consciousness or Feeling."

Most certainly, in the absence of any sign of nervous structure, we should hesitate to admit even the possibility of Feeling, and now we are fully persuaded it is non-existent in the whole vegetable kingdom. But where a nervous system and sense-organs are developed, there *must* be Feeling, sensuous discrimination and consentience. These, however, exist in the animal world without intellectual cognition, and they exist in each man antecedently to intellectual cognition. It is manifest that the child feels pain before it knows it or its own body—not, of course, before it has some sensuous cognition of pain. But that "sensuous-cognition" even of the human infant (for all its innate intellectual nature) is a very different thing from the intellectual cognition of pain, as pain, by the adult. Its sensations of pain are, however, the very same *qua* sensations, as in the adult; the only notable difference is the effect of directing upon these sensations the reflex intellectual activity of the mature and awakened intellect. Certainly, therefore, "sensation" is and must be antecedent to "cognition" in the full and true meaning of the latter term.

The whole essence of a most false metaphysical system is insinuated into the mind of the simple reader by means of a mere passing remark, made as if it were an undisputed and indisputable truth, instead of a most absurd and egregious error. Dr. Bastian says (p. 174): "As ideas are merely weak copies or revivals† of sensations, it is only natural," &c. But ideas are not only *not* merely copies or revivals of sensations, but they are fundamentally, and *toto cælo*, of a different nature. Hume's doctrine (which is the one Dr. Bastian thus quietly introduces as if it were an axiom) is really an absurdity as great as to say that a marble Venus is a

* A similar distinction may be drawn as to "Memory."

† And yet according to Dr. Bastian, sensations are secondary, and cognitions primary!

permanent copy and persistent revival of the implements and strokes by which it was wrought out of the marble in which for untold ages it had been potentially present.

As might be, from the foregoing, expected, the crude notions of Hartley, James Mill, Spencer, Bain, &c., are given out as if they were refined truths. Dr. Bastian quotes (pp. 175, 176) from James Mill (with respect to the association of ideas) approvingly, as follows: "The word 'gold,' for example, or the word 'iron,' appears to express as simple an idea as the word 'colour' or the word 'sound.' Yet it is immediately *seen* that the idea of each of these metals is made up of the separate ideas of several sensations: colour, hardness, extension, weight." We have here a childish fallacy presented as if it were a fact.

A little further on, our author continues (p. 183): "It seems plain, therefore, that a gradual transition may be traced between simple sensations and the most elaborate perceptions; that there is a difference in degree rather than in kind, between these two processes; and that James Mill was not without justification in making use of the latter term, and in speaking merely of 'simple' and of 'complex' sensations." Thus, according to these sapient and discriminating teachers, because a sensation contains an element of sensuous cognition, therefore intellectual cognition is nothing but sensation!

Of course Dr. Bastian fully accepts the popular belief that congenital powers of animals are the inherited results of the acquisitions of their remote ancestors. No tittle of proof is offered for this belief, but some interesting quotations are made from Mr. Douglas A. Spalding's observations on the instinctive powers of birds.

Many of Spalding's observations were made upon young chickens, some of which were carefully hooded as they emerged from the egg, and two or three days thereafter, so as not to permit the incidence of any sight impressions. The young birds being then placed on a smooth white surface, sprinkled with some seeds and insects, the hoods were removed, and the creatures' acts were carefully timed and duly recorded in a notebook.

Often at the end of two minutes, Spalding says, they followed with their eyes the movements of crawling insects, turning their head with the precision of an old fowl. In from two to fifteen minutes they pecked at some speck or insect, showing not merely an instinctive perception of distance, but an original ability to judge, to measure distance, with something like infallible accuracy. . . . They never missed by more than a hair's breadth, and that, too, when the specks at which they aimed were no bigger, and less visible, than the small dot of an i.

One of these chicks, when unhooded, acted as follows :—

For six minutes it sat chirping and looking about it ; at the end of that time it followed with its eyes the movements of a fly twelve inches distant : at ten minutes it made a peck at its own toes, and the next instant it made a vigorous dart at the fly, which had come within reach of its neck, and seized and swallowed it at the first stroke ; for seven minutes more it sat calling and looking about it, when a hive bee coming sufficiently near, was seized at a dart and thrown some distance, much disabled. For twenty minutes it sat on the spot where its eyes had been unveiled, without attempting to walk a step. It was then placed on rough ground, within sight and call of a hen with a brood of its own age. After standing chirping for about a minute, it started off towards the hen, displaying as keen a perception of the qualities of the outer world, as it was ever likely to possess in after life. . . . It leaped over the smaller obstacles that lay in its path, and ran round the larger, reaching the mother in as nearly a straight line as the nature of the ground would permit.

Experiments were also made with regard to the sense of hearing. Chicks, before they had fully escaped from the shell, were rendered more or less deaf by sealing their ears with several folds of gummed paper. Three of them were found, when thus treated, to be so deaf, that they remained perfectly indifferent to the voice of the mother, separated from them by only an inch board. After having been kept in a bag in a dark room till they were between two and three days old, the ears of these three chicks were uncovered, and Spalding says :

On being placed within call of the mother, hidden in a box, they, after turning round a few times, ran straight to the spot whence came what must have been very nearly, if not actually, the first sound they had ever heard. These facts are, as he adds, conclusive against the theory that, in the history of each life, sounds are at first but meaningless sensations ; that the direction of the sounding object, together with all other facts concerning it, must be learned entirely from experience.

But just as young chicks follow the call of their mother before they have had any opportunity of associating that sound with pleasurable feelings, so do they, and other young birds, appear to be inspired, independently of all education on their part, with an immediate Emotion of dread, or sense of danger, at the sight, or on first hearing the cry, of birds of prey, whose predecessors have been the natural enemies of their predecessors. Thus a young hawk, able to take only short flights, was made to hover over a hen with her first brood, then about a week old.

In the twinkling of an eye, says Spalding, most of the chickens were hid among the grass and bushes. The hen pursued it, and scarcely had the hawk touched the ground a bout twelve yards from where she had

been sitting, when she fell upon it with such fury, that it was with difficulty that I could rescue it from immediate death. Equally striking was the effect of the hawk's voice when heard for the first time. A young turkey which I had adopted when chirping within the uncracked shell, was, on the morning of the tenth day of its life, eating a comfortable breakfast from my hand, when the young hawk, in a cupboard just beside us, gave a shrill chip, chip, chip. Like an arrow the poor turkey shot to the other side of the room, and stood there motionless and dumb with fear, until the hawk gave a second cry, when it darted out at the open door, right to the extreme end of the passage, and there, silent and crouched in a corner, remained for ten minutes. Several times during the course of that day it again heard these alarming sounds, and in every instance, with similar manifestations of fear.

Facts of the kind above cited enabled Douglas Spalding to deduce the following all-important conclusions:—(1) That young chickens can display an intuitive perception by the eye, of the primary qualities of the external world, as well as an appreciation of the distance and direction of sounds on the occasion of the first exercise of the ear; (2) That chickens instinctively bring into action muscles that were never so exercised before, and perform a series of delicately adjusted movements ending in the accomplishment of a definite act—independent of any antecedent experience, and, therefore, of any "conception" of such act; (3) That "in the more important concerns of their lives, animals are guided by knowledge which they individually have not gathered from experience."

In concluding this chapter, Dr. Bastian objects to the dictum "*nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu*," unless the "*intellectus ipse*" added by Leibnitz be understood to include ancestral inherited aptitudes. But Leibnitz's addition is quite unnecessary, according to the true meaning of this much misunderstood dictum. That dictum does not mean that there is nothing in "ideas" which were not in "sensations," nor that the faculty of intellect is not of a fundamentally different nature from the faculty of sense. What it really means is, that in external objects and in the activity of sense, there is objectively present that which the intellect, when it is brought into play, is able to elicit and apprehend. It means especially that the intellect is not cramped in subjective "forms of thought," but is able to apprehend the "objective realities of things," and by a process of reasoning to find "sermons in stones and God in everything."

The thirteenth chapter, entitled "Consciousness in Lower Animals," contains a statement of many interesting facts, but need not detain us. It should be noted, however, that where Dr. Bastian uses the word "consciousness," what he means is "consentience." He notices, by the way, some researches of

M. Cyon with respect to the three semicircular canals of the internal ear, which he regards as one organ for appreciating the three dimensions of space. In the next (fourteenth) chapter, the interesting question as to the Nature and Origin of Instinct is entered upon.

He introduces the consideration of Instinct by reviewing purely reflex and automatic organic actions, such as the beating of the heart, the movement of the lungs, and those of the alimentary tube, and he asks why such actions are performed with such undeviating regularity, and at the instigation of mere unconscious impressions? He tells us (p. 221) :

During untold ages, in which organisms have existed with food-taking propensities and alimentary canals, contractions of the intestines have been ensuing at short intervals, in response to the stimulus supplied by food. Since contractile hearts were first evolved, they have never ceased to beat in the lineal descendants of inconceivably numerous generations of slowly modifying animal types. The contractions of oviducts or of the womb, as well as the movements concerned in respiration, also had their beginnings in forms of life whose advent is now buried in the immeasurable past.

But how did these arise? How did the first pulsation of vessels, or expulsion, or indeed formation of ova, take place? Was it due to the voluntary choice of the incipient organisms which first performed them? Such a conception is, of course, absurd, but if they did not so take place, they must have been due to the spontaneous activity of the individual psychical principle which informed such organisms. Such psychical principle itself must have been directly created by God, or else have spontaneously arisen in matter (which had attained a proper degree of preparation)—*i.e.*, have been first potentially created therein by God "in the beginning." There is no possibility of explaining such original organic impulses by merely physical forces. The attempt so to do merely results in "calling names"—*i.e.*, in using words in non-natural senses—an empty juggling with epithets devoid of true meaning.

We have one or two notable instances of verbal self-deception in the present chapter. Speaking of the alimentary canal, the author says (p. 22)*: "Its particular stimulus is not ever present like that of the heart, or only occasionally absent, as with that of the respiratory organs; it has mostly to be sought. *Hence* it is that the habitually recurring need reveals itself as a definitely returning appetite for food. *Much of the same kind of origin* is to be ascribed to the sexual appetite."

What does Dr. Bastian mean by the word "*Hence*?"

* The italics are ours.

It seems, according to him, that the habitually recurring need for food reveals itself as a definitely returning appetite for food, *because* the alimentary canal's particular stimulus is neither "ever present" nor "only occasionally absent." One would like to know in what guise it would reveal itself if the stimulus were "only occasionally absent." It seems the "need for food" would not then show itself as an "appetite for food."

After this very lucid and satisfactory *explanation* of the origin of the alimentary appetite, we feel we should seem somewhat exacting if we were to ask for some more definite account of the "*origin*" of the "sexual appetite," and professed ourselves dissatisfied with being told it was *much* of the same kind.

But far more interesting is the question as to how "conscious intelligence" comes first upon the scene of unconscious organic life. The very next page tells us all about it. Dr. Bastian says: "An appetite for food, or a desire to find a mate, commonly suffices to call certain sense-centres into a state of keen receptivity to impressions, and *thus* affords conscious intelligence an opportunity to come into play for the mind; and the guidance of the animal, &c." "Conscious intelligence" in animals is then, it appears, a thing apart, ready and waiting to come on the scene as soon as a state of keen receptivity has been induced in certain sense-centres by some appetite or desire. We thought that, according to Dr. Bastian, "conscious intelligence," even in ourselves, was but the energizing of certain complex sensations! Even, however, if the mode of entrance of conscious intelligence had been really explained by the words to which Bastian refers in saying "*thus*," its origin would still remain as great a mystery as ever.

Our author tries, like Herbert Spencer, to explain (p. 225), Instinct as "serial aggregations of reflex acts." He fails, however, to show how the instinctive actions which insects perform with a view to the mode of life of a progeny they have never seen, and are never to see, have been brought about; and indeed he ignores (as Spencer and others ignore) all instances of the kind, such as the instinct of the carpenter bee. He quietly observes (p. 235): "There *can be little doubt* that if our means of knowledge were greater than it is, we should be able to explain these and all other instincts by reference to the doctrines of 'inherited acquisition' and 'natural selection,' either singly or in combination." All we can say is, we should vastly like to read his explanation as to how these abstractions (or any realities they stand for) are to bring about such wonderful concrete results. We strongly suspect that in such an attempt we should meet with more than one "*hence*" and "*then*" as little really explanatory as are those in the passages just passed in review.

The perfection of instinct and its intimate connection with structure is well shown by an experiment performed by Mr. Spalding (p. 230). He placed some young unfledged swallows "in a small box not much longer than the nest from which they were taken. The little box, which had a wire front, was hung on the wall near the nest, and the young swallows were fed by their parents through the wires. In this confinement, where they could not even extend their wings, they were kept until after they were fully fledged." The birds were then liberated, and their actions carefully watched. Of two young swallows which had been confined in this manner till their wings had grown, Spalding says: "One, on being set free, flew a yard or two too close to the ground, rose again in the direction of a beech tree, which it gracefully avoided; it was seen for a considerable time sweeping round the beeches, and performing magnificent evolutions in the air high above them. The other, which was observed to beat the air with its wings more than usual, was soon lost to sight behind some trees." He adds: "Titmice, tomtits, and wrens, I have made the subjects of a similar study, and with similar results."

Dr. Bastian contends for a certain plasticity of instinct. We cannot grant him the possibility of such a thing, but we very willingly concede (what comes to the same thing both for him and us) that the sensuous cognition of animals practically modifies actions which are mainly instinctive. Some interesting examples of such modification have been given by Mr. Romanes. His account is as follows:—

Three years ago I gave a pea-fowl's egg to a Brahma hen to hatch. The hen was an old one, and had previously reared many broods of ordinary chickens with unusual success, even for one of her breed. In order to hatch the pea-chick, she had to sit one week longer than is requisite to hatch an ordinary chick. . . . The object with which I made this experiment, however, was that of ascertaining whether the period of maternal care subsequent to incubation admits, under peculiar conditions, of being prolonged; for a pea-chick requires such care for a very much longer time than does an ordinary chick. As the separation between the hen and her chickens always appears to be due to the former driving away the latter when they are old enough to shift for themselves, I scarcely expected the hen in this case to prolong her period of maternal care, and, indeed, only tried the experiment because I thought that if she did so, the fact would be the best one imaginable to show in what a high degree hereditary instinct may be modified by peculiar individual experience. The result was very surprising. For the enormous period of eighteen months this old Brahma hen remained with her ever-growing chicken, and throughout the whole of that time she continued to pay it unremitting attention. She never laid any eggs during this lengthened period of maternal supervision, and if at

any time she became accidentally separated from her charge, the distress of both mother and chicken was very great.

Eventually the separation seemed to take place on the side of the peacock. . . . In conclusion, I may observe that the peacock reared by this Brahma hen, turned out a finer bird in every way than did any of his brothers of the same brood which were reared by their own mother ; but that, on repeating the experiment next year with another Brahma hen and several pea-chickens, the result was different, for the hen deserted her family at the time when it is natural for ordinary hens to do so, and, in consequence, all the pea-chickens miserably perished.

Mr. Romanes also relates the following singular circumstance :—

A bitch ferret strangled herself by trying to squeeze through too narrow an opening. She left a very young family of three orphans. These I gave, in the middle of the day, to a Brahma hen, which had been sitting on dummies for about a month. She took to them almost immediately, and remained with them for rather more than a fortnight, at the end of which time I had to cause a separation, in consequence of the hen having suffocated one of the ferrets by standing on its neck. During the whole of the time that the ferrets were left with the hen, the latter had to sit upon the nest, for the young ferrets, of course, were not able to follow the hen about as chickens would have done. The hen, as might be expected, was very much puzzled at the lethargy of her offspring. Two or three times a day she used to fly off the nest, calling upon her brood to follow ; but upon hearing their cries of distress from cold, she always returned immediately, and sat with patience for six or seven hours more. I should have said that it only took the hen one day to learn the meaning of these cries of distress : for after the first day she would always run in an agitated manner to any place where I concealed the ferrets, provided that this place was not too far away from the nest to prevent her from hearing the cries of distress. Yet I do not think it would be possible to conceive of a greater contrast than that between the shrill piping note of a young chicken and the hoarse growling noise of a young ferret. On the other hand, I cannot say that the young ferrets ever seemed to learn the meaning of the hen's clucking.

During the whole of the time that the hen was allowed to sit upon the ferrets, she used to comb out their hair with her bill, in the same way as hens in general comb out the feathers of their chickens. While engaged in this process, however, she used frequently to stop and look with one eye at the wriggling nestful, with an inquiring gaze expressive of astonishment. At other times, also, her family gave her good reason to be surprised, for she used often fly off the nest suddenly with a loud scream, an action which was doubtless due to the unaccustomed sensation of being nipped by the young ferrets in their search for the teats.

It is further worth while to remark that the hen showed so much uneasiness of mind when the ferrets were taken from her to be fed,

that at one time I thought she was going to desert them altogether. After this, therefore, the ferrets were always fed in the nest, and with this arrangement the hen was perfectly satisfied, apparently because she thought she had some share in the feeding process. At any rate, she used to cluck when she saw the milk coming, and surveyed the feeding with evident satisfaction. . . . Altogether, I consider this a very remarkable instance of the plasticity of instinct. The hen, it should be said, was a young one, and had never reared a brood of chickens. A few months before she reared the young ferrets, she had been attacked and nearly killed by an old ferret, which had escaped from his hutch. The young ferrets were taken from her several days before their eyes were open.

The fifteenth chapter of Dr. Bastian's work, treats of "Nascent Reason, Emotion, Imagination, and Volition," and is occupied by three corollaries deduced from the views antecedently put forward as to rational and reflex action. The first corollary is, (1) that all the definite acts of the lowest organisms resemble reflex or simply instinctive actions—which is most true. The two other corollaries are (2) that the actions of creatures with lowly developed brains are mainly instinctive, and but little due to anything like reason (which is also true); and (3) that the actions of creatures with higher brains are less instinctive and more rational—which is also true, if we mean by "reason" "sensuous cognition." Dr. Bastian quotes from Sir John Lubbock many interesting instances of the natural and thoroughly instinctive action of bees—in spite of the wonderful tales which credulous naturalists have related.

After two chapters on the brain structure of beasts, we come to one on "the mental capacities and powers of higher brutes." As to this we must express regret that the author has not exercised a little judicious scepticism. He reports a variety of more or less wonderful tales, half of which we do not believe to be facts, while what may be true is falsified by fanciful interpretations *ad libitum*, of which the following passage* (p. 328) may serve as a specimen: "When Dr. Hermes left the gorilla on the previous Sunday the latter showed the doctor his tongue, clapped his hands, and squeezed the hand of the doctor, as an indication, the latter believed, of his recovery." The touchingly simple faith of Dr. Hermes is edifying; and, no doubt, were he called in with Dr. Bastian to investigate a miraculous cure, or to the bedside of some holy ecstatic, it would be necessary to caution them earnestly against being carried away by a pious credulity. Our author's faith, however, is not unaccompanied by the other theological virtues. He remarks, in concluding: "If the anthropoid apes, possessing, as they do, such a well-defined basis of intelligence

* The italics, as usual, are our own.

and emotion, were endowed with articulate speech, so that they might benefit and mutually instruct one another—even merely by oral traditions and communications—how great a progress in the degree and range of their intelligence might be expected after a few hundred generations had lived under the influence of such conditions." The hopeful charity evinced in this passage is unfortunately somewhat marred by the fact of its being a truism. No doubt, were anthropoid apes men, they would act and develop in a human manner. The remark is of course far from being a truism in its author's eyes; but this is due to the fact that Dr. Bastian, as so many other kindred spirits, does not understand what language really is.

The nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first chapters are occupied by a description of the development and anatomy of the human brain, matters which, though replete with interest, space does not permit us to enter into. Moreover, such questions are not those which most concern us; so we pass to the following chapter, which has the very promising title, "From Brute to Human Intelligence," and which ought to contain the very essence of a book the main object of which is to prove the essential bestiality of man, and the consequent folly of his entertaining any hopes as to a future lot different from that of the beasts which perish. It is a disappointingly short chapter of but seventeen pages—a small space indeed for a writer so wordy as is Dr. Bastian. Short as it is, however, he has managed to make it the vehicle of spreading a not inconsiderable number of errors and sophisms, while yet conceding to his opponents all they need demand.

The hypothesis he supports is, that rational language is but a further development of the emotional language of brutes, and that articulate speech having arisen, it generated reason—the first articulate words having grown out of sounds intentionally emitted to imitate the noises made by various natural objects. This is the view of Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Romanes, and of the whole school which deems man to be a mere development from the brute. We, of course, maintain that intellect is anterior to language—*i.e.*, the concept to the articulate sound—the *verbum mentale* to the *verbum oris*: not but what there is the most intimate connection between the two, since in a rational animal language of some kind follows rapidly and immediately upon the possession of intellect, which intellect is strengthened and developed by the use of language.

The author quotes (p. 414) the following passage from Dr. Mansel:—

In inquiring how far the same process can account for the invention of language, which now takes place in the learning it, the real question

at issue is simply this: Is the act of giving names to individual objects of sense a thing so completely beyond the power of a man created in the full maturity of his faculties, that we must suppose a Divine Instruction performing precisely the same office as is now performed for the infant by his mother or his nurse; teaching him, that is, to associate this sound with this sight?

Dr. Bastian himself adds: "This question may be asked in the interests of a human race naturally evolved, with as much cogency as in reference to the hypothetical man created in the full maturity of his faculties." But this is not true. That a rational animal should give forth rational language spontaneously is what we can understand, but that an irrational animal should do so amounts to a contradiction in terms. If such a creature were to give it forth it would *ipso facto* be rational.

The whole question lies in a nutshell. The question is: Can the irrational psychical principle of a mere animal become an intellectual principle by any mere force of incident forces, including those which spring from a gregarious habit?

Our author quotes some excellent and interesting passages from Dr. Thomson's (the highly-gifted and very estimable present Archbishop of York) book on the "Laws of Thought." He does not, however, quote certain passages in which that prelate defends the essential intellectuality of language, and the superiority and antecedence of the *verbum mentale* to the *verbum oris*. Then Dr. Thomson says (p. 44):—"Without language all the mighty triumphs of man over Nature which science has achieved would have been impossible. But this does not prove that man might not, without speech, observe objects, gather them into groups in his mind, judge of their properties, and even deduce something from his judgment." The view he defends as to the origin of language he thus expresses (*l. c.* p. 45):—

The Divine Being did not give man at his creation actual knowledge, but the power to learn and to know; so he did not confer a language, but the power to name and describe. The gift of reason once conveyed to man, was the common root from which both thought and speech proceeded, like the pith and the rind of the tree, to be developed in inseparable union. . . . In the fullest sense, language is a divine gift, but the power and not the results of its exercise, the germ and not the tree, was imparted. A man can teach names to another man, but nothing less than divine power can plant in another's mind the far higher gifts the faculty of naming.

The very essence of our contention is that there is an absolute necessity of supposing that in some, to us necessarily unimaginable, way this rational nature was introduced into the world. We contend that reason makes it certain that no mere natural process could have brought this about, but only a Divine influence,

and that consequently there is a most profound difference of kind between brute and human nature. Strange to say, this essential position Dr. Bastian (unless he says what he does not mean) surrenders, without seeming to see that his whole contention is thereby utterly refuted. He says (p. 415):—"An endowment like Articulate Speech, when once started—whether by some *hidden and unknown process* of natural development, or as a *still more occult GOD-SENT GIFT TO MAN*—was by its very nature almost certain to have led its possessors by degrees along an upward path of cerebral development."

We will go further than he does, and say it is not "almost" but *absolutely* certain so to have led.

Dr. Bastian shows, as might be expected, that apparent utter absence of any comprehension of the meaning of ethics which infallibly accompanies a superstitious belief in man's bestiality. After speaking (p. 416) of the sympathetic feelings of dumb animals, he says:—"In such exercise of mere brute sympathy, we have one of the most important germs of those altruistic feelings which attain so much breadth and power in higher races of man." No doubt this is true; but such developments—"feelings"—afford not the slightest clue to the genesis of moral *perceptions*, which alone constitute "conscience." He continues—

Equally important, however, among savage races, are those limitations which "expediency" compels the individual to recognize, as imposed by his fellow-men upon the freedom of his own actions. Such consideration, in concert perhaps with a strengthening sympathy, gradually tend to build up within him an inward monitor, or "Conscience," at the same time that there arise embryo notions of Right and Duty, constituting the foundations of a dawning "Moral sense."

So that, according to Dr. Bastian, each ethical movement of the mind is a mixture of sympathy and selfishness—a pursuit of pleasures and temporal gains for ourselves a little more remote and enduring than those which first present themselves for choice; such calculated postponement of pleasure (that it may be the greater) being aided by a blind feeling of sympathy, such as some attribute to brutes.

This is by no means all that has to be animadverted upon in the passage quoted. He tells us that these impulses "tend to build up 'Conscience,' at the same time that there arise embryo notions of Right and Duty." Thus, according to Dr. Bastian, "Conscience" is one thing, and "a perception of Duty" another thing. What, then, does he deem "Conscience" to be? There is yet a further confusion. He speaks of "*notions* of Right and Duty constituting the foundations of a strong 'Moral sense'." Thus we have a "*feeling*" built upon "*perceptions*." We should much like to know what the author means by that

chimæra, "Moral sense," which thus "dawns" upon such curious "foundations?" But, in fact, Dr. Bastian here really gives up his own position. "Observe!" he says, "that while sympathy and selfish feelings are combining to build up our altruistic feelings (for such feelings as that he seems to mean by 'Conscience') there arise 'at the same time,' and independently, embryo notions of Right and Duty." Therefore, such notions (*i.e.*, ethical perceptions or conscience) really arise spontaneously from an unexplained origin, and Dr. Bastian turns out to be an ethical intuitionist after all! Why, then, did he write this book and fancy himself an evolutionist of the Spencerian school? "*Que diable allait il faire dans cette galère?*"

We much fear, however, that these apparent admissions are merely slips of the pen, the meaning of which their author did not realize; for he evidently does not believe in Virtue or Conscience, but only in a combination of Sympathy and enlightened selfishness. Deeming, as he does, that our ethical judgments have the origin he assigns them, he naturally adds (p. 416): "Having such an origin, the impulses of such a 'faculty' cannot fail to harmonize with prevalent opinions and influences." No doubt if they *had* such an origin they *would* so harmonize; but, as it is a plain fact that they do not so harmonize, we may take his assertion as evidence that such want of harmony shows they must have had a different origin. Has Dr. Bastian never met with the words, "The noble army of martyrs praise Thee"?

We now turn to the question as to the priority of speech or thought. As to this, Dr. Bastian does not hesitate. He tells us (p. 417): "Language is, however, indispensable, not merely to the communication, but to the formation of Thought, since it favours the Birth of Concepts or General Notions, and is essential both for their 'preservation' and 'familiar use.'" But how can anything (A) which favours the birth of another (B) be indispensable to the *formation* of the latter, even though it should be essential to the "preservation" and use of B?

A nurse may favour the birth of an infant, and be essential to its preservation; but the nurse does not "form it"! To support himself, he quotes (p. 418) one of the many foolish passages in Dr. Mansel's "Prolegomena Logica." It is as follows: "In the child learning to speak, words are not the signs of thoughts, but of intuitions: the words *man* and *horse* do not represent a collection of attributes, but are only the names of individuals before him. It is not until the name has been successively appropriated to various individuals that reflection begins to inquire into the common features of the class. Language, therefore, as taught to the infant, is chronologically prior to thought, and posterior to sensation."

Now, words are neither the signs of "thoughts" nor of "intuitions," but of "things as known by concepts." The words *man* and *horse*," or the terms "*bow-wow*" and "*gee-gee*," addressed to an infant, do not, either in the mind of the adult or of the infant, mean merely the individuals pointed out. This every father knows. Every father who cares to observe must note with what extreme facility his child forms true universals after making use of sounds to denote far more extensive classes than they properly serve to denote. These first terms are certainly not true and explicit universals, but neither are they true singulars. They are as yet indeterminate, neither one nor the other actually, though virtually they are already universals. It is an absurdity of which both Dr. Mansel and J. S. Mill ought to be ashamed, to think that a child uses such words as *horse* or *gee-gee* as the name of an individual. It could not conceive the idea "individual" without at the same time having the idea "general." A child very soon rises to the highest universals, as is shown by its exclaiming, "What is that thing?"

Of course, in one sense, "language, as taught to the infant, is chronologically prior to thought;" for it must exist in the teacher before he begins to teach the child. But this trivial meaning is not, of course, Dr. Mansel's.

Dr. Bastian quotes much from the writings of the late Mr. G. H. Lewes, whose loss he deplores. We deplore it no less. We have always had much sympathy with, and much esteem for, Mr. Lewes. An exceptionally well-read man, a clear thinker—as far as he went—and one who appeared honestly to follow out his convictions, without undue deference to men who have gained popularity, we greatly hoped he would live to tackle the problem of the genesis of language and intellect. Had he done so, we are confident his candid mind would not have rested satisfied with such assertions as those thrown out by him of late years. He clearly pointed out many of the distinctions between human intellect and brute cognition. He said, "Animals are intelligent, but have no intellect; they are sympathetic, but have no ethics; they are emotive, but have no conscience." Dr. Bastian tries to explain this away (p. 423) and says animals are "guided to action by judgment; they adapt their actions by means of guiding sensation, and adapt things to their ends." So do bees, so it appears do even the Foraminifera; but this does not show "judgment." It shows, indeed, a power of "associating impressions;" but judgment—in the proper sense of that term—is necessarily an intellectual operation due to a power of abstraction.

Mr. Lewes has well said:—

The absurdity of supposing that an ape could, under any normal circumstances, construct a scientific theory, analyze a fact into its

component factors, frame to himself a picture of the life led by his ancestors, or consciously regulate his conduct with a view to the welfare of remote descendants, is so glaring that we need not wonder at profound, meditative minds having been led to reject with scorn the hypothesis which seeks for an explanation of human intelligence in the functions of bodily organs common to men and animals.

He adds, however, a passage quoted approvingly by Dr. Bastian, but which is profoundly untrue. It is as follows:—

The savage is not less incompetent than the animal to originate or even understand a philosophical conception; the peasant would be little better than the ape in presence of the problems of abstract science. . . . Nor are the moral conceptions of the savage much higher than those of the animal. His language is without terms for justice, sin, crime; he has not the ideas. He understands generosity, pity, and love little better than the dog or the horse does.

Our own personal experience enables us to categorically contradict the assertions here made, and the work done at the Benedictine Abbey in Western Australia affords ample evidence of their untruth even as applied to, perhaps, the very lowest of the human race.

To this chapter, which is the climax of the book, succeed other chapters which treat of the structure of the brain and the functional relations of its parts, subjects which it would be beside our purpose here to refer to. They, however, contain one or two passages which may interest our readers.

One of the points which he has to consider is the mode of origin of that crossing of the optic nerves which takes place in back-boned animals—and which, of course, on his principles, has to be accounted for by minute accidental changes and natural selection. He tells us (p. 480): "The elongation of the head of a fish, together with the lateral position of its eyes, may have had something to do with the fact of the occurrence of a decussation of the budding optic tracts in some of the early forms of fishes. . . . The cross relation between the halves of the brain and the body may have been initiated in some fishes in a quasi-accidental manner." We hope our readers may now understand how this practice was brought about; but for our own part we should very much like to understand what Dr. Bastian means by a "*quasi-accidental manner*." Unfortunately, the ignorant are too easily imposed upon by obscure verbiage such as has just been quoted.

Our author, however, delivers his testimony against a belief in "double-consciousness," saying (p. 492) that no appreciable advance has been made in establishing it since the publication of the late Sir Henry Holland's "*Medical Notes and Reflections*," in 1840.

The merely accidental connection which exists between the cerebrum (as the minister to phantasmata) and intellect is supported by instances of the persistence of intelligence in spite of great destruction of that organ. He cites (p. 493) an instance of a man the right hemisphere of whose cerebrum was entirely destroyed, he still retaining all his intellectual faculties.

Dr. Bastian regards the cerebellum as "a supreme motor centre for reinforcing and for helping to regulate the qualitative and quantitative distribution of outgoing currents, in voluntary and automatic actions respectively" (p. 509).

The result of Dr. Ferrier's experiments on monkeys are detailed; but Dr. Bastian says (p. 530) that, though Ferrier supposes his experiments to "support the notion that 'perception centres' limited in area and topographically distinct, exist in the cortex of the cerebral hemisphere," yet "his facts do not necessarily carry with them any such interpretation."

Our author considers (p. 543) that the term "muscular sense" ought to be abolished in favour of the expression "sense of movement" or "Kinæsthesis;" because he regards the activity of motor-centres and nerves as forming no part of "mind," and because he deems the feelings called "muscular" to be really not such, but sense impressions which follow and result from, but do not accompany, outgoing currents and motor energy. He does this in the face of Bain's opinion, that if we abandon the belief that an "active" mode of sensibility is directly dependent upon motor nerves and motor centres, then "the most vital distinction within the sphere of mind is bereft of all physiological support."*

If there is one thing of which plain men are and may be certain, it is the reality (whether free or not free) of their own will; but for this all-important activity no physiologist is able to show any definite organ. Accordingly, the real existence of that of which we may be of all things the most certain is denied by a materialist like Dr. Bastian. He says (p. 569):

How is it that the initiating idea, the desire for a related "end," and the twofold conception of the necessary movements, as co-operating stimuli, are enabled to influence the corpora striata, so as to evoke the movements in question? The obscurity prevailing in regard to this problem cannot at present be removed. We possess no real knowledge on the subject, and merely suppose that Intellect as it passes over into action—whilst seeming to engender a *psychological ghost* named "WILL," operates by transmitting suitable stimulations, &c.

In considering "voluntary movements" he adverts to other experiments on apes carried on by Dr. Ferrier. These interest-

* "Senses and Intellect," 3rd edition, p. 77.

ing experiments tend to show that the cerebral cortex so often supposed to be the organ of *intellect* is, at least, largely an organ of bodily motion. Dr. Bastian admits (p. 578) that they, together with other previously known facts, tend to show "that in higher forms of life the cerebral hemispheres, with the corpora striata, gradually take on some of the functions which in lower animals have been discharged through the intermediation of medullary and spinal centres. The cerebral hemispheres in higher animals come to exercise, therefore, a large proportionate share of influence in the execution even of the common movements needed for locomotion."

Dr. Bastian mentions a case (from his own experience) which proves the belief that the faculty of rational speech is so implanted in man potentially from the first, that even without hearing it might be exercised as soon as growth has made the organism sufficiently mature.

He tells us (p. 606) that in the year 1877 he was consulted concerning the health of a boy, twelve years old, and subject to fits at intervals. When five years old he had never spoken a word, and physicians were consulted in regard to his "dumbness." Before the expiration of another twelve months, however, on the occasion of an accident happening to one of his favourite toys, he suddenly exclaimed, "What a pity!" though he had never previously spoken a single word. He was then again silent for two weeks, but thereafter speedily became most talkative. A distinguished physician assured Dr. Bastian (on being informed of this case) that his daughter had not walked a step or tried to walk up to the age of two years, but that then, upon his placing her one day in a standing position, she forthwith walked from one side of the room to the other. Supposing these cases to be accurately reported and confirmed by others, Catholics should bear them in mind in estimating the miraculous character of various sudden cures of deafness and lameness.

Dr. Bastian, in his twenty-ninth chapter, gives many instances of Amnesia, Aphasia, Agraphia, and Aphemia, or various forms of defect in verbal memory. Such details are of course very interesting to the physician, but have no bearing upon questions which concern us. Knowing well, as taught by the scholastic philosophy, that every thought and volition must have its accompanying physical correlative (to minister to the requisite phantasmata), we know, *à priori*, that with such mental defects there must be some corresponding physical defects, while their exact nature is for us a matter of indifference. Were it not so, however, we should not feel greatly enlightened by reading (p. 638), that in the case of a certain deficiency in speech, "we probably have to do with some grave defects in the auditory word-

centres, or in the kinæsthetic word-centres," all these centres being as yet only matters of speculation.

We now come to the thirtieth and last chapter of the work, one entitled, "Further Problems in regard to the Localization of Higher Central Functions."

Herein it is interesting to note that Dr. Bastian proclaims himself an opponent of Professor Huxley's absurd doctrine that men are "conscious automata," and that neither thought nor sensation can intervene in the endless chain of physical causation.

We read, with much pleasure, Dr. Bastian's repudiation of this error, hoping to be able to claim him as a brother, and to be able therefore to condone many previous offences against rational philosophy. As we read on, however, we found to our great regret, either that Dr. Bastian does not know what "conscious automatism" means, or else that he holds the curious and also materialistic view (which as yet we have never met with any one mad enough to hold), that thoughts and sensation, AS SUCH, are "motions"—not that they are generated by molecular motions, but that they themselves actually ARE physical motions.

As usual, we have to protest against obscurity of expression. As before we desiderated a clear exposition of his meaning in using the term "quasi-accidental," so here we greatly desiderated an explanation of the vague term "kinship." His words are (p. 688) :

It must be conceded that if Conscious States or Feelings have in reality no bond of *kinship* with the Molecular movements taking place in the Nerve centres; if they are mysteriously appearing phenomena, differing absolutely from, and lying altogether outside, the closed "circuit of Motions" with which they co-exist, no way seems open by which such Conscious States could be conceived to affect or alter the course of such Motions. The logic of this seems irresistible. The conclusion can, indeed, only be avoided by a repudiation of the premises; and this the writer does. He altogether rejects the doctrine that there is no kinship between States of Consciousness and Nerve Actions, and consequently would deny the view that the "causes" of Conscious States lie altogether outside the circuit of Nerve Motions.

What can he mean by this passage? Who, in the name of wonder, *does* affirm that there is no kinship between states of consciousness and nerve actions. Certainly we do not, and most certainly Professor Huxley does not. In this we agree, widely as we differ generally. Professor Huxley and his school hold, as we supposed Dr. Bastian to hold, that states of consciousness are the concomitants of certain nerve actions upon the existence of which they depend for their existence—as the luminosity of the wire transmitting a strong galvanic current depends upon the existence of that current for its own existence. The assertion of

"kinship," therefore in no way interferes with the maintenance of the doctrine of automatism. Neither does the denial of "kinship" necessarily favour that doctrine. We admit "kinship" in so far as thought, *hic et nunc*, requires sensuous phantasmata and these require nerve action; but we deny kinship altogether in the sense in which Professor Huxley would assert it, and *à fortiori* in the extreme sense in which Dr. Bastian seems to affirm it.

But though we hold that all nerve affections ("molecular motions," if Dr. Bastian fancies that somewhat foolish and unmeaning term), are fundamentally and absolutely different in nature from thought, we none the less affirm that the latter intervenes in the chain of physical causation. We cannot indeed, see any difficulty in the conception of one complex nature being like a ring formed of two metals, which expand differently with heat; and so the complex whole may be bent one way and another by the action of either one of its constituents.

Dr. Bastian continues (p.688): "Consciousness or Feeling must be a phenomenon having a natural origin, or else it must be a non-natural non-material entity." Why so? Why may it not be a *natural non-material entity*? Such we are convinced is really its nature.

To elucidate his views he compares "Consciousness" with "Heat," saying (p.689): "Heat has no abstract and isolated existence as an entity. Consciousness, also, is a result of a something which moves. But just as it is the very material motions on which Heat depends which do the work ascribed to Heat, so do the very material motions on which Consciousness or Feeling depends, do the work which we ascribe to Feeling." But this is just what Professor Huxley and every conscious automatist would say. Dr. Bastian here contradicts himself, and absolutely excludes feeling from the "closed circuit of motions." But yet he goes on:—"These particular motions enter as components into the 'circuit of motions,' constituting pure actions, and may, therefore, easily co-operate as real motors. Hence it is that States of Feeling may, in very truth, and in accordance with popular belief, react upon Nerve Tissues so as to alter the molecular motions taking place therein." And this amazing statement is made after he has just told us that "material motions do the work which we ascribe to Feeling." He must then mean that the very feelings themselves, *quite* feelings, are really nothing but "motions." If he does not mean this, what he says has really no meaning—it is only comparable with some of the phenomena detailed in his 29th chapter. If he does mean it, he maintains so absolutely isolated and preposterous a view that argument about it would be altogether thrown away.

Dr. Bastian concludes his interesting but very disappointing

work by characterizing the doctrine of Automatism as "one in which all notions of Free-will, Duty, and Moral Obligation would seem to be alike consigned to a common grave." This is the most painful passage of the whole book; for, coming from him, it is, "objectively," "materially," "deceptive," and all our charity is put on the stretch not to believe it to be "subjectively" and "formally" deceptive also. Dr. Bastian is no believer in Free-will, a belief in which would be fatal to his whole philosophy, and he has himself spoken of "Will" as a "psychological ghost." His views, however, as the reader is now in a position to see, are special and peculiar. By them "Free-will, Duty, and Moral Obligation" are certainly not consigned to a "common grave," but to a very *uncommon* one. Dead and buried, however, they are, and must remain, in every region where the idealistic-materialism which Dr. Bastian promulgates exercises its intellectually enfeebling sway.

ART. III.—THE BENEDICTINES IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

1. *Memorie Storiche dell' Australia, particolarmente della Missione Benedettina di Nuovia Norcia.* Per Monsig. Dom RUDESINDO SALVADO, O.S.B., Vescovo di Porto Vittoria. Roma. 1851.
2. *La Nouvelle-Nursie; Histoire d'une Colonie Bénédictine dans l'Australie Occidentale (1846-1878).* Par le R.P. Dom THEOPHILE BERENGIER, O.S.B. Paris: Lecoffre. 1880.

THE history of a missionary enterprise possesses a singular charm. We cannot read about the devoted zeal of men who have sacrificed the comforts and security of civilization for a life of hardship and peril, in their simple-minded endeavour to sow the seed of truth in the heart of savage nations, without a thrill of admiration, and perchance without being stirred up to imitate in our measure the high purpose of such lives. Sometimes the narrative of missionary work has an interest of a special kind, as, for instance, when the circumstances of the enterprise bear a resemblance to those under which our forefathers were won from heathendom to Christianity, and received at once the light of faith and of civilization. A charm of this kind is attached to the history of the Benedictine colony of New Nursia, which is presented to us in the two volumes named at the head of this article. As

we read the vivid account here given of the heroic labours of the Benedictine missionary among the aboriginals of Western Australia, we might fancy we were perusing a page in the history of European civilization. To-day the Sons of St. Benedict are accomplishing in a new world what their ancestors did by the same methods in the Old World a thousand years ago. What St. Anschar was to Denmark, St. Boniface to Germany, and St. Willibald to Friesland, that the Spanish Benedictine fathers are to the savages of Australia. What Ely and Peterborough did for England, Fulda for Germany, St. Denys for France, or any of the numberless monastic colonies for the countries in which they were planted, that the Benedictine settlements are doing for the civilization of the native Australian population.

The principle of "stability" which St. Benedict introduced into the religious life his sons made use of on their missions. Fixed habitations and the cultivation of the soil they considered absolutely essential steps to a civilized life; and the experience gained by the colonization of ancient Rome proved that these methods were the most certain of success. The history of almost every European nation has shown that their theory was correct; and there has been no instance of a race of men who lived by the chase, and possessed no fixed dwellings, becoming civilized whilst remaining in that state. The Benedictine Apostle, on first coming into a country to be converted, sought out some suitable spot for a rude chapel and a few surrounding cells. Here he and his companions lived and laboured, and they preached as much by the example of their virtues and daily toil as by word of mouth; and thus, little by little, the savage people were enticed to relinquish their wild and wandering life, and imitate the quiet settled life of their apostles. Then, by degrees, round the monastery walls there sprung up the huts of the new converts, till in a few years a town or city had been formed. In this way the zealous and heroic Spanish missionary monks, who are doing such a good work in the British colony of Western Australia, have succeeded in their efforts to civilize the native inhabitants. Though the Italian work descriptive of these missions was written by the earnest Benedictine Bishop, Dom Salvado, as long ago as 1851, and though they are known in France by the publication of some articles on the subject in the "*Missions Catholiques*," by Dom Berengier, which were afterwards collected in the handsome volume called "*La Nouvelle Nursie*," the labours of these devoted men, carried on in a British colony, are little known in England; and a brief account of this monastic settlement cannot fail to be of interest to a large section of our readers.

Autumn storms carry seeds from cultivated lands only to repro-

duce a new vegetation in less favoured places. So the political tempest which burst over Spain in 1835, and drove the monks from their monasteries, was the instrument under Providence by which the savages of Australia obtained the blessings of civilization and Christianity. Two Spanish Benedictines, of the monastery of St. Martin, at St. James of Compostella, named Dom Joseph Serra and Dom Rudesind Salvado, took refuge from the revolution in the Italian Abbey of La Cava. Here they lived for some years, and Dom Salvado became renowned as a musician, people coming even from Naples to hear him play on the great organ of the monastery church. After ten years of exile they began to despair of ever returning to Compostella, and determined to devote their energies to some missionary work. With this intention they set out for Rome, and having stated their desire to Mgr. Brunelli, the Prefect of the Propaganda, they were accepted by him as missionaries for the Swan River district in Australia.

In late years Australia has been almost entirely explored, and the number of its states, its towns and its settlements has increased with astounding rapidity. But about the year 1850, which was the date of the first foundation of the colony of New Nursia, there existed in the vast continent only five centres of civilization. On the east was New South Wales, with Sydney as its capital; on the south-east was the colony now known by the name of Victoria, with Melbourne for its capital; South Australia, with its government at Adelaide; Western Australia, with its chief town Perth; and the northern division, in the centre of which was Port Victoria. Our attention may be confined to Western Australia, as it is there that the two Benedictine monks began and carried on their work of the conversion and civilization of the aborigines.

Various attempts had been made by adventurers of different countries to take possession of the vast tract of country known as Western Australia; but it was not till 1829 that Captain Sterling established the first colony, in the name of England, on the banks of the Swan River. He was a native of Scotland, and called the new town, of which we shall presently hear more, Perth. In size Western Australia is equal to about eight times the area of the United Kingdom, and the settled district at the present time extends over an area fully as large as France. The early days of the colony were very unpromising, and for ten years very little advance was made. The inhabitants, in the year 1850, asked that Western Australia should be constituted a penal settlement. Their request was promptly acceded to, and the Swan River district was made into a convict station. In the nine following years some 11,000 persons, either themselves convicts or the

families of the prisoners, were introduced into the colony. After this time, with the other colonies, as they experienced the evil effects of the system of transportation, they appealed to the Home Government to discontinue transportation to Western Australia.

Governor Weld thus describes some of the natural features of this part of the world :—

The whole country, from north to south, excepting the spots cleared for cultivation, may be described as one vast forest in the sense of being heavily timbered; sometimes, but comparatively seldom, the traveller comes upon an open sand plain, covered with plants and shrubs in infinite variety and exquisite beauty, and often, especially in the northern and eastern districts, low scrubby trees and bushes fill the place of timber; but taking the word "forest" in its widest sense, as wild, woody, and bushy country, Western Australia, as far as I have seen, is covered with one vast forest stretching far away into regions yet unexplored.*

The soil consists of vast tracts of sand and scrub, with much land suitable for grazing and farming purposes. In the north there are extensive grassy downs, capable of feeding large numbers of sheep, and the territory round about Victoria plains, where the Benedictines fixed their colony, is said to afford perhaps the best pasture in Western Australia. The soil is admirably adapted for the cultivation of fruit trees, vine-growing, and corn. In all these the native settlements of New Nursia have excelled, and some of the best corn in the country is raised on the Benedictine farm. The capital of the Western colonists was, as we have remarked, Perth, situated on the western bank of the Swan River. In 1850 this town was very far from having attained the splendour of Sydney or Melbourne. Its streets, however, could boast of well-built houses and offices, the chief among which were the Governor's house, the Colonial Office and Court-house, a Protestant and Methodist chapel, and a small, poor Catholic chapel, near to which was a convent of Sisters of Mercy.

Up to this period the Catholics of Australia generally, and particularly those of the Western division, had very little assistance in the practice of their religion. The arrival of Dr. Ullathorne, the present Bishop of Birmingham, in Sydney, in 1832, was the beginning of a better time. Even at that date the vast continent had no bishop of its own, being under the charge of the Vicar-Apostolic of the Island of Mauritius, who had appointed Dr. Ullathorne his Vicar-General. Three years after this, however, the representations of Dr Ullathorne and of the Catholics of the country obtained the appointment of Dom Bede Polding, then engaged in the work of teaching at Downside College, as Vicar-Apostolic of Australia.

* "The Australian Handbook," p. 184.

In 1843 a letter from the Catholics of Western Australia, addressed to Dr. Ullathorne, whom they thought to be the Bishop of Sydney, induced Archbishop Polding to send the Rev. John Brady as missionary to that district. This zealous priest, having commenced the building of a church at Perth, and having worked indefatigably for two years, set out for Rome to beg that this district, situated some 3,000 miles from Sydney, should be made into a distinct diocese. His request was granted, and, on the refusal of Dr. Ullathorne to accept the dignity, Dr. Brady himself was named the first bishop of Perth, and was consecrated at Rome in 1845. It was at this time that the two monks, Dom Serra and Dom Salvado, came to Rome to offer themselves as missionaries, and Dr. Brady at once obtained their services for his diocese.

On June 5, 1845, the new bishop took the two monks to the Vatican to take leave of the Holy Father, Gregory XVI. The Pope, having spoken kindly to the Bishop, turned to the two Benedictines and addressed them in these memorable words:—"Remember, my sons, that you belong to the great family of our glorious patriarch, St. Benedict, your father and mine. You are about to enter on the path trodden by the illustrious apostles who were our brethren. They have converted a great portion of the people of Europe to the Christian faith, and procured for them the blessings of civilization; while by their preaching and labours savage peoples have been transformed into cultured nations. Go then and do honour to the habit you wear, and may Heaven bless your zeal and render your apostolate fruitful."

Two days after this audience the missionaries set out from Rome. At Paris, where they halted for awhile, they were joined by a Benedictine novice from Abbot Gueranger's monastery; and in a letter written by him to his Superior in France, and published in the "*Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*" for 1846, he gives an account of the landing of the small band of missionaries on the shores of Australia.

On Thursday, January 8, 1846, his Lordship said mass for the last time on board. At half-past nine, I recited the Litany of the Saints on deck, with Dom Serra. A short time afterwards we quitted the ship, and during the passage to the shore Dom Rudesind Salvado chanted the Litany, whilst we all answered the petitions. Then, when the Litany was finished, we sang the Benedictus . . . It was ten o'clock when we reached the shore, where some fifty people were assembled. His Lordship immediately intoned the *Te Deum*, which we all sung together, and at the verse, "*Te ergo quæsumus*," we prostrated on the strand. A few paces behind us was the sea, and before us stretched the vast expanse of land—an island which deserves rather the name of a continent.

After the short stay of only one day at Freemantle, which is in reality the port for Perth, they embarked on the Swan River for the latter city. In their brief stay, however, they beheld for the first time some of the savages among whom their lot was to be cast. It was not a pleasant introduction, and their hearts sank on beholding the depth of degradation to which these wretched beings appeared to have fallen during the short time of their intercourse with the European population. Some little distance from the mainland, at Freemantle, lies a small island called Rolnest; and this, at the time of the landing of these Benedictine missionaries, formed a prison for the wretched aborigines of that district, who were relegated to it for the least fault. On the day of their arrival at Freemantle, the missionaries saw a band of twelve savages pass through the town on their way to the island. They were chained one to the other, and were of all ages. Mere children were fastened to men far advanced in years; but even the young had the brand of crime on their countenances, and their acquaintance with vice was proclaimed in their manners. What struck our missionaries most of all, amid so much that was new, was the sight of these aborigines, who wandered through the streets of Freemantle, like dogs, in quest of food. They appeared to be always on the verge of starvation, and lived from hand to mouth. Their only idea of supporting themselves was by the chase, never having domesticated any animal but the dog. Flocks and herds they never possessed, and thus had to depend on whatever Providence sent to them. When they were fortunate enough to obtain a good meal they gorged themselves, and like wild animals moved about again only when hunger compelled them to prosecute another search. Their appearance was repulsive to those accustomed to a European population, and, if the truth be told, they were, in the days of which we speak, treated by the white settlers more as dogs than as human beings. For the most part the English looked upon the native Australian as a mere animal, and used him as such; and so far from contact with a civilized world having tended to improve his sad condition, it had taught him only the vices of modern society. It was openly asserted that the aborigines were utterly irreclaimable, and sprung from so low a type of humanity that they had absolutely no faculties to receive moral and spiritual truth. It is hardly possible to credit the brutality with which these poor savages were treated by those who boasted the possession of civilized habits. Up to 1827, and even later, they were ranked in the lowest category of animal life, and were almost universally disposed of as we should get rid of vermin. Poisoned food was given them, and clothes which were infected with every form of disease. They were hunted down like wild beasts, and dogs were even trained

for this particular kind of barbarous sport. "Last week," says the *Colonial Times*, July 6, 1827, "a party of our citizens killed a large number of savages. They surprised them seated round their fires, and having placed themselves on some rising ground near, shot them down with a carbine without running any risk themselves." To such an extent was this wholesale butchery carried on, that in 1845 there were only four aborigines left in the entire district of Sydney; and it was not till many years later that a colonial judge, in spite of a vigorous outcry, condemned a white man to death for the cruel murder of a native Australian.

Very few serious attempts had been made by the Colonial Government to civilize the native population, and a general feeling appeared to prevail that, the sooner the aboriginal race was got rid of, the better for all concerned. In Western Australia, it is true, a small school had been opened by the Government for native children, but little good resulted from the attempt, which at the time of the landing of Dom Serra and Dom Salvado had been almost abandoned. It was left to these Spanish Benedictines to prove how utterly false was the English estimate of the savage character, and how much a little patience and perseverance, mingled with faith and charity, could do for the souls and characters of the aborigines.

For above a year after their landing in Australia, Dr. Brady kept the two missionaries in Perth. He appeared to have little faith in any real good being done among the savage inhabitants of the bush, and he and other friends did what they could to dissuade the two monks from undertaking a mission so full of danger. Every imaginable difficulty was placed in their way, and it was not till the beginning of 1846 that they were allowed to carry out their desires.

On the 16th of February (says Bishop Salvado) taking our little possessions on our backs, with a crucifix on our breasts and sticks in our hands, we betook ourselves to the church, where Dr. Brady was waiting for our arrival. The whole colony, informed of our intended departure, filled the humble cathedral of Perth; for Protestants as well as Catholics wished to say "good-bye" to us, as they quite thought it would be for ever. The Bishop addressed us in terms which greatly touched those who were present; and having received his blessing and the kiss of peace, we quitted Perth, being accompanied on our way by a large portion of the population. The moon shed its soft light on our path, and behind followed two carts containing provisions, a change of clothes, some agricultural implements, and a portable altar.

For the first five days the missionaries travelled along a good road, in a direction north-east of Perth; and they then arrived at a farm some sixty-eight miles from the city, which was the furthest outpost of civilization. Here they halted three days to

recruit their strength before entering the vast unknown region which stretched out before them. Starting once more, they soon had to experience great suffering from want of water. After many hours of intense anxiety, however, they came upon a supply which satisfied their wants; but this was only the first of many days of similar suffering experienced by them during their wanderings in the bush. On the day following the drivers whom they had hired in Perth refused to go a step further into a country so difficult and dangerous to travel in, and in spite of all remonstrances deposited the contents of the carts under a tree, and turned their backs on the Benedictine Fathers and their two assistants. To be left alone in the woods, without means of transporting the little store of goods they had brought from Perth, caused the missionaries great anxiety. They, however, as it was the first Sunday in Lent, made an altar under a wide-spreading tree, and offered up their masses to obtain God's protection and blessing on the work they were thus beginning. They then set to work to construct a rude hut of branches, and whilst thus engaged did not at once notice a troop of savages which had gathered about them. Their looks were not reassuring, as they leaned upon their long spears and eyed the strangers attentively. The missionaries, however, manifested no sign of the distrust they certainly felt, and went about their work as if no one was near. Having finished their hut, they lit a fire, and then quietly sat down by it and sang their compline, as if they had been in their monastery at Compostella. The night passed without much sleep for them; and the following day, understanding from the looks of the savages that they were about to attack them with their lances, they anticipated the movement and advanced towards them, making signs that they meant only peace, and offering sugar and rice cakes. This completely disarmed the savages, and by these little presents they succeeded in making them friends.

For a time the missionaries and their savage allies remained near the rude hut they had contrived, until, all the provisions the monks had brought from Perth being consumed, hunger obliged them to go in search of food; Dom Salvado and his companions went also on these hunting expeditions, and shared the labours and fatigues of those they wished to convert. Often when the women were tired, the missionaries took their turn in carrying the children of the party on their backs. When the men brought into camp a kangaroo or other large animal they held a feast. They had no thought of the morrow till it came with its own necessity. Many a time they had to content themselves with a few roots and wild fruits, or perhaps with a lizard or two or a few earthworms. This was indeed a hard life for those who had been accustomed to civilized ways; but they made good use of their

wanderings in the woods to note each new word and expression, in order to form some knowledge of the language which was to enable them to speak the message they came to deliver to these savage people.

This novel mode of life had many other discomforts than those occasioned by the nature of the food and their ignorance of the language. The reflection of the sun on the parched soil of that country caused the missionaries most intense suffering, and for a time it appeared likely that all except Dom Salvado would lose their eyesight. One day, when they were very ill and in great pain, Dom Salvado went off into the woods to try if he could obtain anything with which to make the sick some soup. After wandering about for some time he came to a part of the woods which appeared alive with parrots. At once the idea suggested itself to him that if he could obtain one of these birds he would be able to give his companions a great treat, and without further thought he took a stone and, aiming carefully, was delighted to see a fine bird drop to the ground; but his delight was of short duration, for immediately he found himself attacked most vigorously by the whole number of parrots, and had the greatest difficulty in fighting his way back to the camp, without his bird and very much injured by the beaks of his numerous adversaries. The constant want of water to drink was a terrible trial to the missionaries also, as it produced an almost intolerable thirst, which their constitutions were not fitted to bear.

After enduring these hardships for three months, they began to see that it was impossible and useless for them to continue as they were; and Dom Salvado, the strongest of the party, offered to return to Perth for assistance in their need, and thus to enable them to continue longer with their savage friends. He set out under the guidance of a youthful savage of the tribe, named "Bigliagoro."

On the road (says the Bishop) we ate anything we could find, which was often only lizards and earthworms. Bigliagoro always left me the best part of what we caught, but my stomach often revolted against what was required of it. At the end of some days, however, I could eat anything; and I must say that a grilled lizard, a boiled maggot, or a steak of possum cooked in a handful of green leaves, with an earthworm or two, are not the most disagreeable of food, particularly when one has fasted since the morning.

On the arrival of Dom Salvado in Perth, Dr. Brady, the bishop, tried to prevent his return to the bush, and endeavoured once more to make him abandon a mission so full of danger and hardship. With great firmness the monk withstood all entreaties, and refused to give up a work once begun. For some time he

had the greatest difficulty in getting money to enable him to buy the things he and his fellow-missioner stood most in need of. At last, however, it struck him that he would turn his talents as a musician to account, and give a concert in Perth. The idea was approved of by every one, and people of every form of religion assisted him to make it a success. Dom Salvado appeared on the platform in his Benedictine habit, or rather such part of it as remained after his wanderings in the bush.

My tunic (he says) was in tatters, and only came down to my knees; my stockings, which I had tried to mend with any kind of thread, presented the most strange appearance as to colour; as to my shoes, they were broken in numberless places, and displayed my feet as much as they covered them. Add to this a beard which had been allowed to grow wild, a face black as that of a collier, and hands like those of a blacksmith. I thought I should be an object at once of compassion and laughter. Loud applause, however, greeted me and gave me courage.

For three hours Dom Salvado delighted his audience with an exhibition of no ordinary musical skill; and what was more to him, the collection made at the end, added to the price of seats, formed a good round sum with which to make his purchases. He soon got together a supply of clothes, provisions, seeds, and a plough, and with these all packed in a waggon he had bought he set out to return to his companions. He hoped to have a quick and easy journey, but the wet season had unfortunately set in, and he experienced the greatest difficulty in finding his road. On the second day he was overtaken by a severe storm, during which he lost his path. For some time he travelled on in ignorance of his mistake. "It was a terrible moment," he says, "when I first discovered my error. The thought of finding myself alone, without a guide, in this vast solitude, and in such a season, troubled me more than I can say. I knew not which way to turn, so I threw myself on my knees, and raising my hands and eyes to heaven called upon God to help me. My short prayer gave me confidence, and taking my oxen by the horns I turned them, and began to retrace my steps. After an anxious march of many miles I regained my first tracks, and continued my journey."

A few days after this, whilst crossing a marshy piece of ground, the cart sunk in the mud down to the axletrees, and the oxen, after making one or two attempts to move it, gave up the struggle, and no amount of persuasion on the part of Dom Salvado could urge them forward. "I thought," he says, "that in such an extremity I might be excused if I were to employ the most energetic means; I consequently gathered a bundle of dry leaves and sticks, and, placing them under the animals, set them on fire. The oxen, on feeling the flames on their hair and skin,

made the most desperate efforts to escape, and dragged the cart out of the mud."

Even then he found himself but little better off, for the animals so obstinately refused to be yoked again, that there was nothing to be done but to place the load on their backs and to abandon his waggon. This, with great reluctance, he did, and having placed on his own head a cage full of fowls, he slung across his shoulders a sack containing a cat intended to make war upon the multitude of mice which, in the bush, infested every encampment and eat up all they could reach, leading by a string a big dog and his sole remaining goat, he drove his oxen before him, and pushed on for the place where he had appointed to meet his companions.

Their meeting was not so joyful as he had anticipated, since he found that one of the three, Gorman, the Irish catechist, had died, under the hardships of their life, only a few days before his arrival. On the arrival of Dom Salvado they consulted together and came to the determination of making some fixed habitation in a place where they could easily procure water. Having found a suitable spot, in the month of August they constructed a rude hut and set about bringing the land round about them into some sort of cultivation. Dom Serra led the oxen, while Dom Salvado guided the plough; and so well did they work that in a month they had sown several acres with corn, and planted a great number of fruit trees. During this period of labour they still constantly studied the language of the aborigines, and little by little gained such an influence over them that they many a time were able to interpose in the continual fights the tribes had one with another. Providence also enabled them often to work most wonderful cures, by means of very simple remedies, in favour of the people they desired to influence. Gradually the example of these two Spanish monks, working silently in the fields, and devoting their lives to works of Christian charity, added to these wonderful cures they effected, had the desired influence on the minds of the savages. At first they regarded them with wonder, and then began to look upon them as superhuman beings, and were ready to listen when they wished to speak about religious subjects. The great difficulty they experienced was the method of life led by the native Australian. The savages were obliged to be ever on the move in search of food, and even then seemed to be perpetually on the verge of famine. The only means of appeasing their hunger known to them was by hunting, and the missionaries felt that it was not possible to civilize such a people whilst they continued this mode of life. They had tried to follow them to their hunting grounds, but the result of their experience was that this labour and all the hardships they had braved

had been thrown away. Moreover, they remembered the old traditional monastic method of evangelization. Europe, they knew, had never received the faith in the way they at first attempted. St. Austin of Canterbury, St. Willibrord of Utrecht, St. Boniface of Mayence, and all those other great monk missionaries, had begun their work by the foundation of a monastery, which in time became the centre of religious and civilized life. The experience of their forefathers in religion had proved that savages would in time be induced by example to copy the method of a civilized and pious life begun in their midst. And thus Dom Serra and Dom Salvado resolved to imitate, in the Australian bush, a policy which had been successful in Europe.

Full of their scheme they returned once more to Perth to solicit the approval of Dr. Brady. After some time they obtained what they asked, and having bought more clothes and seeds, they set out once more for the bush in the December of 1846, expecting to find that the fields they had sown and their fruit trees were ready to return them their labour. Great, however, was their disappointment when, on their arrival at the scene of their labours, they found that a "mob" of wild horses had utterly destroyed everything. These herds of wild cattle, and "mobs," as they are called, of wild horses, all of course descended from stock that had been at one time imported by the colonists, are the causes of great destruction to the property of the settler. Mr. Trollope says that it is by no means an uncommon thing for a man to drive four or five hundred horses into an enclosure and there slaughter them to rid himself of what is one of the greatest pests to the squatter. It was one of these wild herds that swept over the little patch of cultivated ground the two monks had prepared so carefully and planted so successfully, and which left it an entire wreck. At the same time they received a notice from the British authorities that they could not be allowed to settle upon the land they had themselves cleared and rescued from its native wildness. They were discouraged, but were, however, so fully persuaded of the ultimate success of their schemes, that they determined to begin once more. Having obtained some forty acres of land on the banks of the River Moore, at a place called Victoria Plains, they commenced at once to prepare the land for cultivation. A number of French and Irish colonists from Perth came to their assistance, and they began to build a spacious house of stone and a stable for their animals. In fifty days the wild solitude of that portion of the River Moore had completely changed its aspect, and a stranger, had he gazed upon the scene, might have thought he beheld the well-kept homestead of a farm in England. They led a busy life those fifty days. The monks ploughed up the ground and scattered the seed in the furrows. The colonists built up the

walls, and the savages, coming at first to look on, stopped to aid in cutting down the trees in the clearing, while their children watched the flocks. They called their settlement by the name of New Nursia, in memory of the little town in Italy which is honoured as the birthplace of the Patriarch of monks, St. Benedict. It was on April 26, 1847, that they took possession of their little monastery with great joy. "We imagined," says Dom Salvado, "that we were again possessed of our grand old abbey of St. Martin at Compostella."

A wonderful instance of the manner in which Providence assists those who rely upon it is recorded of the period when the monastery was being built. A dog named Pompey had long before this time been given to Dom Salvado, in Perth, for the purpose of hunting the kangaroo. Up to this date, however, he had not been of much use; but when the building of the monastery had begun, and the services of every one were required for the work, each morning of his own accord Pompey would go off into the woods, and return in the evening with the native who had followed him, bringing into the camp a kangaroo he had caught. This, strange as it may appear, was always large enough for the whole party. And what is still more strange, perhaps, is, that as the work was being brought to a conclusion, and the number of workmen lessened, the size of the kangaroo caught by the dog grew smaller, and the day the work was finished was the last time he went out to hunt.

In a very short time the calculations of the monks began to be realized. The aborigines at first came from all parts to look at buildings which were so strange to them. They admired them greatly, and soon some endeavoured in a rude way to imitate the work of the monks, and fixed their huts near the new monastery. This was what the missionaries had hoped for; and a new concession of land being obtained, many of the savages asked to be allowed to aid in getting it ready for cultivation, and later on joined the monks in gathering in the harvest. The time of rest necessary during the heat of an Australian summer was devoted to instructing the savages in the truths of religion. At this time one of the aboriginal assistants, being mortally wounded, was the first to receive baptism at the hands of the Benedictine fathers.

During the first harvest, another incident, which shows the protection of Providence over the little colony, is recorded. The monks had given great offence to a certain savage by protecting his wife from his brutality. After vainly attempting to frighten Dom Salvado into giving the woman up to his blind anger, he went off into the woods threatening revenge. It was soon clear what he intended to do, as shortly afterwards the bush was

reported to be on fire, and the flames, driven on by a strong wind, rapidly approached the mission. All efforts to stay the progress of the conflagration proved useless, and not only their new building, but their entire harvest was threatened. In their extremity, Dom Salvado ran to the chapel, took from the altar a picture of the Madonna, and carried it in the direction most in danger. In a moment the wind, which had for some days been blowing from the same quarter, changed and drove the flames back upon their first track, and not the slightest damage was done to any of the monastic property. This wonderful event, which was witnessed by so many of the natives, made a deep impression on their savage minds, and led to numerous conversions. Even the savage who had attempted the injury was so struck by this manifestly supernatural interposition, that he came and acknowledged his crime, and afterwards became one of the most useful and respected of the assistants of the mission. Knowing the value of a proper road from their new settlement to Perth, the missionaries had no sooner gathered in the harvest than they determined to begin this work. Dom Salvado undertook to superintend the gang of fourteen natives who had volunteered for the labour. They finished the forty miles which lay between New Nursia and the nearest colonial settlement in three weeks; and during this time the Benedictine father, whilst so constantly living and working with the aborigines, was able to learn a great deal about their customs and language.

In the year that followed they opened a school for the children of the native Australians, who were beginning to see the advantages a quiet settled life had over the wandering and uncertain life of the chase. With the consent of the parents, three of the youthful savages received baptism, and came to live in the monastery and share the life of the monks. It was a great happiness to the good and zealous monks to listen to the young Australian neophytes joining their voices in the choir duties, and to see them, dressed in cassock and surplice, devoutly serving at Holy Mass. At the same time the number of families that came permanently to settle near the monastery was constantly increasing, and almost daily one or more of the converted savages received the waters of baptism. Each morning the monks, at a certain hour, gave away a basin of soup to any one who would come for it; and at this hour they could always be certain of an audience to whom they could speak on religious matters. This practice, which is still preserved, resulted in very great and lasting benefits to the mission. Matters progressed so rapidly that in January, 1848, Dr. Brady held a Synod of the Diocese of Perth at New Nursia; and the result of a year's experience of this Benedictine method of conducting the Australian mission work being considered so

satisfactory, the monks were authorized to buy of the Colonial Government some 2,560 acres of land. To obtain funds for the purchase of this territory, and also if possible to procure additional assistants, Dom Serra set out for Europe, taking with him a young savage who had been baptized Benedict. Dom Salvado remained at New Nursia, and commenced the second year of his work by assigning a piece of land to each of the savages who had aided in the building and cultivation of the soil. The aborigines were delighted to think themselves the real possessors of a portion of land, and at once began to clear and sow it. The missionary next tried the effect of payment for work done, explaining carefully how money saved up would purchase in time something they might desire very much—a sheep, a pig, an ox, or a horse. The idea was grasped more quickly than he anticipated, and, with Dom Salvado for a master and adviser, they speedily learnt to appreciate, not only the value of money, but the advantage of labour which could obtain it for them. Another happy effect of this was that it brought the aborigines into commercial relations with the European settlers, and tended to eradicate the very unjust estimate the colonists had formed of the native Australian.

Whilst Dom Serra was in Europe, Dom Salvado enlarged the monastery very considerably, in order that it might be able to accommodate any assistant labourers Providence might send them from Europe. At this time also he obtained from the English Government letters of naturalization for himself. This proved most useful in many ways, and particularly in gaining for him an increase of respect and authority from the natives. As an English subject he was allowed to plead before a magistrate; and he soon made use of this privilege to defend a poor Australian native who had been charged with sheep-stealing, but whom he knew to be innocent. His intervention obtained the acquittal of the poor prisoner, and made a great impression on the mind of the savages, who more than ever learnt to regard the zealous monk in the light of a powerful protector.

The harvest of this summer was most abundant; and, under the teaching of the indefatigable missionary, the aborigines quickly became skilful reapers. A portion of the corn was stored in the monastery granaries, and what they were not likely to want themselves was taken into Perth and exchanged for other necessities. The savage nature was gradually becoming tamed, and the aborigines now very seldom sighed for the roving life of the chase, but desired to live quietly near the monastery walls.

During the heat of the Australian summer it was necessary to drive the flocks away into the bush in search of food. This, which was necessary for the sheep, often caused Dom Salvado and the natives the most intense suffering, as water was everywhere

most scarce ; but one happy result of bush life was that it tended to attach the aborigines more than ever to their friend and father, Dom Salvado, and to make them sigh for the comforts of their home life.

The following year, 1849, Dom Salvado learnt that Dom Serra had been made Bishop of Port Victoria. Shortly afterwards Dr. Brady earnestly entreated Dom Salvado to proceed himself to Europe on business of the Diocese of Perth. With great reluctance he complied, and, accompanied by two young converted aborigines, Conaci and Dirimerà, he landed at Swansea. Making only a short stay in England and France, he took his young converts to the Pope at Gaeta, who with his own hands clothed them in the habit of the Order of St. Benedict. The King of Naples engaged to pay for the support of the two youths at the monastery of La Cava, which they entered as students for New Nursia.

Shortly after Dom Salvado's interview with the Pope, he learnt that Dom Serra had been appointed coadjutor to Dr. Brady, and that he himself was destined to be Bishop of Port Victoria. His efforts to escape from the burden and dignity were of no avail, and Cardinal Frasoni consecrated him on August 15, 1849. Meantime, Dom Serra had been in Spain, and had got together a large number of subjects for the Australian mission, who, on the arrival of Bishop Salvado in Barcelona, all, to the number of twenty-eight, received the Benedictine habit. A sad disappointment was in store for Bishop Salvado. On the very eve of the departure of the band of missionaries for Australia he was informed that the English Government had completely suppressed the colony of Port Victoria, and that he was thus left a bishop without subjects. The city of Port Victoria had only been of quite recent creation. It was situated some 1,800 miles to the north of the Benedictine colony of New Nursia. In forming it, the Government had expected that it would quickly become a centre of civilization and trade ; but in both these respects they were doomed to disappointment. Navigation to it through the Straits of Torres was found to be difficult and dangerous ; and while it impeded the growth of trade in other towns, there was no reasonable prospect of its own ultimate development. When, moreover, it became known that the district was certainly an unhealthy one, and quite unsuited to the conditions of European life, the English Government, though they had sanctioned the appointment of Dom Salvado to the new see, promptly determined to disperse the whole colony. Thus Bishop Salvado found himself with a mere title, and charged with a place which had ceased to exist, and which could hardly be ranked even with sees "in partibus infidelium." In this difficulty he was obliged to delay his departure

from Europe to obtain some instructions from Rome, and he had reluctantly to allow Mgr. Serra to set out for Australia without him. This Dom Serra did, accompanied by his large band of missionaries. He was received with great joy at the mission, though the delight of the natives at his return was somewhat modified by the absence of Dom Salvado. This latter was long detained in Europe, in almost daily expectation that something or other would be settled as to his future work. He, however, made good use of his forced detention away from his colony, where his heart was, to compose his most interesting "*Memorie Storiche*."

In 1853 he returned once more to his beloved mission, which had suffered much during his long absence, but which, on his return, grew and developed in every direction by reason of his marvellous energy and the extraordinary life and enthusiasm with which he was capable of inspiring those who aided him. In 1854 Mgr. Serra was compelled by reasons of health to return definitely to Europe, and for some time Bishop Salvado acted as coadjutor to Dr. Brady, his wonderful strength enabling him to do the work of two men. After three years, however, he asked that a coadjutor should be appointed, and from this time he has devoted himself exclusively to his colony. A large monastery and spacious church of stone have been completed, and two schools are well attended. Round about the monastic buildings, as in the old days of Europe's early civilization, cluster the neat houses of the native Australians—storehouses, workshops, enclosures for cattle and horses, fields brought under the finest cultivation, such is the picture presented by New Nursia of the present day. The newest improvement is a steam threshing-machine, which has been the admiration and wonder of the natives. Last year a cricket eleven went from the settlement to try conclusions with an eleven of white men at Perth, and, if we remember right, they returned victorious. The Abbot-Bishop is the life of the place, its father and oracle. Nothing can be done without him; his advice is sought about the most minute details of the colony, and to him all the sick of the settlement are brought for medicine and advice. During the years 1877 and 1878, which brought famine to India and China, on him devolved the anxious task of providing food for his numerous family.

The entire population is governed by a very strict code of customs. They rise with the sun, and while the monks, two and two, go to their office in the church, the villagers pour in for their morning prayers, after which they scatter over the fields to work. Office over, the religious join them in their labour, and it is a very ordinary thing to see a tall muscular savage leading a team, while a monk in his black habit holds the plough, and directs it with no ordinary skill.

Bishop Salvado does not attempt to keep his native converts always at the mission or labouring in the cultivation of the fields. "From time to time," he says, "I send them, the men converts and the young people of the mission, for a week or two into the bush, with only a very small bag of flour. They must find the rest of their food by hunting, and must lie on the ground in huts of branches which they have made. By these little excursions I obtain two excellent results—I strengthen the constitution which a too confined life in this generation would undermine, and I teach them by contrast all the advantages of a family life in New Nursia."

The following account of the school founded by Bishop Salvado for native children, as it now exists, is of considerable interest. It is taken from the ninth chapter of Dom Berengier's interesting volume:—

The school at present contains upwards of fifty children of both sexes. The boys and girls have separate school buildings, where they receive from the missionaries a religious and liberal education. They are taught to read and write, and have a good knowledge of arithmetic and sacred history. They rise with the sun, at the sound of the monastery bell. The Benedictines have recognized that to form the entire man the family life must be united with that of the citizen. They consequently make all the children spend the night with their parents in their own homes. When dressed, they betake themselves to the church, whither their parents soon follow them. Then comes mass and the Laudate, after which they go to their respective refectories for breakfast. Breakfast over, half an hour is given for recreation, which is followed by some work suitable to their age; some help the shepherds to lead their flocks to the pastures, some work in their parents' gardens, others in shops of different trades. The little girls assist their mothers and sisters in cooking, or learning to sew, &c. At eleven all work for the children ceases, and they troop off to their studies for the hour before dinner. At twelve this is served to them by the monks, and consists of simple but abundant food. Then again comes recreation, always joyous and noisy, and a visit to their parents, so that they may see and know each other once more; from two to four in winter, and three to five o'clock in summer come studies and class work, which is followed by manual labour till sunset. After this they have their supper and evening hours with their parents at home, followed by prayers altogether in the church, and then to bed in the winter at eight and at nine in the summer.

Bishop Salvado's one desire has been for a long time to be allowed to pass the remainder of his life in the midst of the family he has gathered round him, and to which he is everything. At one time he was nominated to the Bishopric of Perth, and was obliged to come to Europe to escape the burden. He was

able, to his great relief, to persuade Cardinal Barnabò, then Prefect of the Propaganda, that his special mission was to be with his beloved savages, and the remarkable results his energy had achieved in New Nursia procured for him a singular mark of approbation from the Supreme Pontiff. Pius IX. on the feast of St. Gregory the Great, 1867, published a Bull by which he erected the monastery into an abbey "nullius diocesis," thus forming the colony and adjacent territory into a real diocese distinct from that of Perth. Monsignor Salvado was named as the first perpetual abbot and bishop, and it was declared that these dignities should descend to his successors. We have only to add that, after assisting at the General Council, and making an attempt to found again the Benedictine Order in Spain, which was unhappily frustrated by the revolution, and after a short sojourn among his Benedictine brethren in England, Monsignor Salvado returned once more to his colony, where he still continues the labours to which he has devoted the best years of his life. Though some few settlements have of late years been formed between New Nursia and Perth, it still remains the most advanced outpost of civilized life in Western Australia. For this Bishop Salvado is particularly thankful. He has no wish that the first generation of his civilized aborigines should have too great an intercourse with the European population. At one time he had great fears that his endeavours to keep his new converts from contamination by the vices of those who belonged to an ancient civilization would not be long possible. Gold was discovered in small quantities at a place not above twelve miles from New Nursia, and the district was at once overrun with gold-seekers. The "find," however, proved to be so small that the number of diggers soon dwindled down, and Bishop Salvado was spared what he considered a very great misfortune.

Protestant and independent testimony is not wanting to the remarkable success of the Benedictine mission—the success of the work undertaken by the Spanish monk. A Protestant clergyman wrote to his bishop—"What I saw at the Spanish mission of Perth reminded me of the early days of the Church." Miss Florence Nightingale, of Crimean reputation, after her visit to the colonies, wrote—"The necessity of allowing the habits of civilized countries to penetrate gradually into savage nations, by means of education, seems to me to be nowhere understood except in the Benedictine monastery of New Nursia." A Protestant paper, *The Perth Gazette*, in 1867, wrote the following:—

Preaching alone will not produce the civilization of the savages of Australia. The first thing is to make them upright, laborious, and industrious. This is a more difficult thing than to make them Christians

only in name. So far, the only true success has been obtained by the Catholic colony of Victoria Plains. In this mission of the Spanish monks, the natives were very happy, educated to work, and to recognize the advantage of it. . . . The success obtained by the Benedictines of New Nursia shows us clearly the only means by which a happy result may be obtained. But for Protestants it will always be difficult to establish and maintain a similar institution, with our habits of comfort, and above all to find a like number of men so full of self-abnegation, patient, persevering, and entirely devoted to this work of civilization.

We cannot finish without calling the attention of the reader to the very different estimate of the character of the aborigines, and of the possibility of civilizing them, formed by the self-sacrificing Bishop Salvado and the ordinary English writer on Australia, of whom Mr. A. Trollope may be taken as a fair specimen. In the fourth chapter of his work on Australia, which he devotes to the "Aboriginals," he paints their character in the darkest hue—

They were, and are (he says) savages of the lowest type. They were in total ignorance of the use of metals, they went naked, they ill-used their women, they had no houses, they produced nothing from the soil. They had not even flint arrow-heads. They practised infanticide. In some circumstances of life they practised cannibalism. . . . Their sagacity, especially in the tracking of men or cattle, is very wonderful. The skill with which they use the small appliances of life which they possess is very wonderful. But for years, probably for many centuries, they have made no progress, and the coming of the white men among them has had no tendency to civilize—only a tendency to exterminate them. . . . It might be possible to teach a dog to carry a mutton chop without eating it; and perhaps an aboriginal might be found who, after many lessons, would not do so either. . . . Of the Australian black man we may certainly say that he has to go. That he should perish without unnecessary suffering should be the aim of all who are concerned in the matter.

The whole of Mr. Trollope's chapter should be read to appreciate the difference between his view of the native of Australia and that taken by Bishop Salvado, and proved by the success of his work. Six or seven years ago the Bishop wrote a small pamphlet in English to defend the character of the Australian savages against the unjust criticism of English writers, amongst whom were some of the Government agents. His defence was considered so valuable that it was ordered to be printed and published at the expense of the Colonial Government. In reality, however, the best defence is to be found in the history of the colony of New Nursia itself. Bishop Salvado and his Benedictine brethren have succeeded in doing what we are so constantly told cannot be accomplished—changing the savages of the bush into useful Christian citizens.

A letter written by the Bishop, in April, 1878, speaks as follows :—

The Australians received and instructed in our monastic colony never return to a savage life, as the Protestant neophytes almost always do, and this though for one reason or another they leave New Nursia. Last year some of my baptized savages left the mission, but not to dishonour our teaching. The first went to establish himself as a shoemaker in Perth; it was the trade he had learnt at New Nursia. His skill and steadiness is remarkable, and the Perth journals say that he is the best shoemaker in the colony. . . . Another savage, civilized by our Fathers, is gone to work for an English colonist, and has taken his Australian wife with him. The colonist is so pleased with their fidelity that he has built them a house and given them a garden. The man is general servant, groom and gardener, and his wife the cook and laundry-maid. A third native took service with another colonist. He soon learnt to appreciate the services of this converted savage, and, not satisfied with giving him £3 a month, besides his board, has lately made him his butler: the other servants, English and Irish, have now to obey him.

Can these be the men, we are led to exclaim, who have been declared utterly incapable of any kind of civilization?

ART. IV.—TRACTARIANISM AND RITUALISM.

1. *Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*—I. In Twelve Lectures addressed to the Party of the Religious Movement of 1833; II. In a Letter addressed to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on occasion of his Eirenicon. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, of the Oratory. Fifth Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.
2. *Anglican-Ritualism, as seen by a Catholic and Foreigner: a Series of Essays, with an Appendix, on the Present Position of the Church in France.* By Abbé P. MARTIN, D.D., Professor of Holy Scripture in the Catholic Institute of Paris. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.
3. *The Church under Queen Elizabeth: an Historical Sketch, with an Introduction on the Present Position of the Established Church.* By the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.D., Vicar of All Saints, Lambeth. Two vols. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

A NEW edition of Cardinal Newman's Lectures on "Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching" has lately been issued, to which, at the present moment, it may be useful to call attention. They were addressed thirty years ago to a generation

now fast passing away; and although containing much that is valuable for all times, may, as being only a reprint, escape notice in an age when the fact that a book is new seems to carry a recommendation disproportionate to its intrinsic merit.

Yet, there are especial reasons why those who are interested in the religious life and thought of England should not allow these Lectures to be forgotten, or to become the property of mere theological students; for perhaps no writings of Cardinal Newman's exemplify his almost prophetic genius more completely than these words of warning, addressed in 1850 to the High Church party in the Establishment. What he here tells us would happen, as a fact, has happened: dangers he foresaw, weakness he suspected, untruth to first principles in the future which he then saw to be inevitable in those whom he addressed—we can already point to in the past. The tense alone requires to be changed; for the future let us put the past, and we have the history of the Tractarian Movement during the last thirty years.

The Twelve Lectures now before us are divided into two portions. In the first, Cardinal Newman assails and seems to destroy the *locus standi* of those of whom he had so lately been the distinguished leader; in the second, he defends that "mighty mother" in whose bosom he had at length found the fulfilment of his aspirations after the doctrines of the fathers and the devotion of the saints, and explains certain prejudices and misunderstandings likely to prove a hindrance to Englishmen in joining her communion. In both may be found much that cannot but interest even non-theological readers—theories which adjust apparent contradictions; stray ideas opening out long vistas of thought, seemingly thrown out from the mere exuberant wealth of his rich mental store, and all in language which, were the matter nought, would alone be sufficient apology for commanding our attention. But the matter is far from being nought, and may with all earnestness be again brought to the notice of those who stand, or rather who claim to stand, where Cardinal Newman's audience then stood.

We question, however, whether any party in the Establishment can be considered as now fairly representing the principles first advocated in 1833. There are those who claim to do so; but, if holding an identical position means holding identical principles, would those who startled Oxford fifty years ago own as their legitimate successors the modern Ritualists? Looking back, we see position after position, and positions once deemed essential, abandoned as the exigencies of facts made them untenable, till, to use an old simile, first the handle was changed, and then the blade and then the handle, till the identity of the High Church-

man of to-day seems hardly one with that of the High Churchman of 1833.

In 1850, Cardinal Newman tells the party that it "will be most inconsistent if with (its) views and principles (it) remains in the Establishment" ("Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching," page 108). He admits, "You *may* knowingly abandon altogether what you have once held, or you may profess to hold truths without being faithful to them" (*ibid.* p. 109). But, he concludes, "My brethren, I think too well of you, I hope too much of you, to fancy that you can be untrue to convictions so special and so commanding. No; you are under a destiny, the destiny of truth—truth is your master, not you the master of truth—you must go whither it leads. You can have no trust in the Establishment or its Sacraments and ordinances. You must leave it, you must secede; you must turn your back upon, you must renounce, what has—not suddenly become, but has now been proved to you to have ever been—an imposture. You must take up your cross and go hence" (*ibid.* p. 109).

Many no doubt thus addressed did not refuse the cross offered; and the result we can to some extent see in the different standing of the Catholic Church in England in 1850 and in 1880. In their very lifetime the cross has become a crown, and success following on their efforts is seen at every corner in churches, convents, schools; in priests, missions, and conversions; till what was but an aristocratic sect seems fast growing into a popular power. Nevertheless, in a large party the number of those who fully realize the logical consequences of their views is small; and even amongst these all are not fully prepared to make the great sacrifices which they may demand. So many are led to take up ideas because this or that of their accidents pleases them, from personal influence or chance association. Had they known whither these ideas led, they would have let them alone; and they feel as if more than they had bargained for was being asked, when the principles which they had intended should merely embellish, refine and give a grace and a poetry to their life, demand their very life itself. They rebel when asked to sacrifice on the altar of consistency friends and home, early associations, all

The tender memories of the past,
The hopes of future years.

And this, not on the certitude of mathematical demonstration, but to the logical following out of their first principles—a logic which may now and then elude them—and at the risk (so they would despairingly argue) of deserting an appointed post, of failing where God had meant they should stand, and of succumbing to trials of His sending. For the certitude of faith follows, but does

not always precede conversion. Considerations such as these no doubt weighed with many in the eventful years 1845-1850, and lessened the numbers in the exodus from the Church of England that then took place. As Cardinal Newman says elsewhere, "God has not chosen every one to salvation: it is a rare gift to be a Catholic." It can therefore be no matter of surprise that all whom we may judge ought then to have entered the Church did not as a fact become Catholics.

A number sufficient to continue the Tractarian party in name and form were unmoved by Cardinal Newman's words and remained where they were. It is their fortunes, as affected by the principles with which they started, that we propose to follow. They and their successors claim the position of those who were the life of Oxford from 1833 to 1850. They are the modern Ritualists, who insist on being the legitimate successors of the Tractarians, and who claim to have continued the work begun, and which, even amid present discouragement, they refuse to acknowledge has failed.

None has a better right than Cardinal Newman to be accepted as an authority, when he tells us of the leading idea which animated himself and his friends when the party started in 1833. It was, briefly, to catholicize England by means of the Establishment. This was the end, and as a principal means to its accomplishment, the out-rooting of Erastianism by means of exalting the Episcopate. Let us consider how the prospects of such a task have fared after fifty years, during which many earnest and enthusiastic men have devoted their lives to the work. It is a melancholy retrospect, as the record of entirely wasted energy must always be. It is a long history of gallant endeavours to do the impossible, and of failure, which is perhaps only the more touching from often being unsuspected by its victims; of endeavours, which have only helped the enemy they went forth to combat; of efforts, which have merely precipitated the latitudinarianism which they were working to destroy.

We could, however, feel more sympathy with the Ritualist of to-day and his disappointments, had "*Anglican Difficulties*" never been written. In these Lectures Cardinal Newman so prophetically warns the party of the inevitable results of remaining within the Establishment, of the impossibility of using a Protestant Church practically against itself, to catholicize a nation (an attempt which Cardinal Newman can only liken to "endeavouring to evangelize Turkey by means of Islamism"): he exposes the weakness of Tractarianism so unsparingly; he enunciates its principles and their failure when tried by facts so clearly; he so generously grants all the most sanguine would claim, and even then shows its nullity, and, worse than all, cuts the

ground so mercilessly from under the few consolations with which a Ritualist may comfort himself—as, in the words of the Apostle, to “leave them without excuse.”

At this date, we are sufficiently far removed from the Tractarian movement to be in a position to judge it without prejudice. When calmly looked at, ought its failure to surprise us? Did it not from the very beginning start wrong? The Catholic theory is that the Church teaches individuals: did not individuals in 1833 attempt to teach the English Church? Not that the leaders at the time would have acknowledged this; they repudiated with energy the idea that their teaching was at all influenced by their private judgment. Cardinal Newman expounds to us precisely the foundation of their principles: “The movement was based on submission to a definite existing authority, and private judgment was practically excluded” (“Anglican Difficulties,” p. 117). Their appeal lay immediately to the Prayer-book and to the bishops of the Establishment, remotely to antiquity.

The authority, however, of any written word seems fated sooner or later to prove as wanting in solid foundation as the fabulous tortoise which supported the globe. Whether it be the authority of Bible, Prayer-book, doctor, or father, the question of who is to interpret the word sooner or later arises. In this instance the prayer-book was proved by a catena of English divines, and the authority of the English divines by the writings of the Fathers; and here for awhile, it was believed, firm ground was reached. What the Fathers meant it was supposed none could dispute, their teaching was so distinct as to preclude the possibility of any use of private judgment. Here the Anglo-Catholics were safe, and Protestantism was condemned. “The present Church declared what her divines had declared; and her divines declared what the Fathers had declared; and what the Fathers had declared was no matter of private judgment at all, but a matter of fact, cognizable by all who chose to read their writings” (*ibid.* p. 131). “Judge, then, of their dismay, when, according to the Arabian tale, on their striking their anchors into the supposed soil, lighting their fires on it, and fixing in it the poles of their tents, suddenly their island began to move, to heave, to splash, to frisk to and fro, to dive, and at last to swim away, spouting out inhospitable jets of water upon the credulous mariners who had made it their home” (*ibid.* p. 132).

An imposing building had been raised, but on what did it rest? On the Prayer-book, which rested on the Anglican divines, who rested on the Fathers, was the answer. The Fathers were appealed to in order to crush Protestantism, and they did it effectually; only too effectually. No more was asked of them; and at this point they *ought* to have stopped short. They were appealed to

as teaching apostolic succession, Church government, baptismal regeneration, and they taught them all. But, unfortunately for the Anglican theory, they taught with even greater persistence such "Romish corruptions" as Papal supremacy and purgatory, the invocation of saints, and the veneration of relics. If we appeal to an authority, we are bound to accept all he says; we cannot quote him as all but inspired in one text, and refuse to listen to him in the next. This the leader of the Tractarians at any rate could not do; he could not "accept the lesser evidence and reject the greater" (Newman's "Development of Christian Doctrine," p. 24). He has himself told us his feelings at the discovery that the Fathers he had called on to destroy Protestantism, so to say, overdid their work. "They *would* protect Romanists as well as extinguish dissenters. The Anglican divines *would* misquote the Fathers, and shrink from the very doctors to whom they appealed. The bishops of the seventeenth century were shy of the bishops of the fourth, and the bishops of the nineteenth were shy of the bishops of the seventeenth" ("Anglican Difficulties," p. 133).

The appeal to antiquity may therefore be said to have failed; there remained the second basis, which ought to have been identical and one with the first, the living voice of the Church. The bishops of the Establishment, it was argued, must agree with the Fathers; and the Fathers thus supported might have propped up Tractarianism. But apparently, in their hurry to condemn the movement, the bishops hardly paused to examine what support it really derived from antiquity. They were bishops of the National Church (Anglo-Catholic, if you please, but National first), and it was plain "the National Church cared little for primitive Christianity, or for those who appealed to it as her foundation" (*ibid.* 134). The principle of the Tracts was to "exalt our holy Fathers as the representatives of the Apostles and the Angels of the Churches." For a moment, the "Angels of the Churches" were silent, recovering perhaps the shock of finding themselves the objects of such unusual veneration. It was, however, but the lull before the storm; "external authority" at length spoke out with no measured or hesitating voice; an essentially undogmatic Church for a moment almost seemed to grow dogmatic in order to condemn. "Bishops spoke against them, bishops' courts sentenced them, universities degraded them, the people rose against them, from that day their occupation was gone" (*ibid.* 134). It was the beginning of the end. "Let us go hence," must now be the cry of all who had mastered, and were prepared to stand by, the principles of 1833.

The cry, "Let us go hence," came as a mighty wave well nigh engulfing the party—a shock from which the Establish-

ment is still staggering, sweeping into the waters of one broad deep ocean nearly all of the learning, the poetry, the graceful refinement and the dogmatic power of the movement. There for awhile they lay, recovering breath, by no means having relinquished the hope of Catholicizing England, but owning that the attempt to do the impossible had failed; that Turkey would never be converted to Christianity by means of Islamism; "that if you would make England Catholic you must go forth on your mission *from* the Catholic Church;" that the one and only duty its members owed to the Establishment, was to leave it. Meanwhile, so feebly had the party really touched the life of the National Church "that the huge creature shook itself and went about its work as of old time" (*ibid.* p. 10). What had appeared a powerful limb had been amputated; but so little had it been really part of her body, that, except to rejoice, she heeded little its loss.

If, however, we look closer along the shore so lately swept by the wave of consistency, we see here and there a solitary being clinging to a rock; here and there a figure who, though bruised and battered, yet has somehow contrived to keep his feet; and as the wave recedes further and further, and those it engulfed are lost to sight, these to some extent recover themselves, begin to look around them, and to consider if indeed all is lost. No doubt there must be discouragement; commanding voices that once spoke for them will now speak against them; energy once directed to propping up the Establishment will now work to uproot it; but the remnant, not having allowed their principles to get the better of them, determine, in spite of all, to go on much as if nothing had happened. They will still appeal to principles, only they will remember to stop short of their fatal conclusions. The Episcopate shall still be exalted in theory, but unheeded in practice. England shall still be catholicized by means of, and yet in spite of, the Establishment. A Church that has proved herself Protestant, and is teaching Protestantism, is in possession, and the nation accepts that teaching; their work shall yet be to force the Church to teach Catholicism and the nation to embrace it.

"Of what consequence the annoyance of a few heads of houses and the condemnation of local ephemeral authority?" asked Mr. Bennett, in "The Church and the World" (second series, p. 18). Of what, indeed, if our principle is to do what is right in our own eyes? Very much, if we eschew all private judgment and appeal to external authority. And it is the fact that the appeal to authority is now withdrawn that cuts off the Ritualist of to-day from the Tractarian of thirty years ago. "A bishop's lightest word, *ex cathedra*, is heavy," said the Tract—the most

direct reproof, the most earnest request now falls unheeded on the Ritualist's ear. An indirect censure arrested the Tracts—a positive command now fails to remove a picture or a vase from a Ritualist church. The leading idea of the Tracts was to destroy Erastianism by exalting the Episcopate. Erastianism is no doubt still to be destroyed, but in the ritualistic programme no longer by the combined strength of bishops and clergy against the State, but by the individual opposition of individual priests to both bishops and State. Cardinal Newman tells the fate of the movement at the hands of the bishops thirty or forty years ago: "They fearlessly handselled their Apostolic weapons upon the Apostolic party. One after another in long succession they took up their song and their parable against it. It was a solemn war-dance, which they executed round their victims, who by their very principles were bound hand and foot, and could only eye with disgust and perplexity this most unaccountable movement on the part of their 'holy fathers, the representatives of the Apostles and the Angels of the Churches'" ("Anglican Difficulties," p. 133). The war-dance is still in process of execution, but its solemnity is, we fear, now somewhat marred; indeed, we are not sure that a free fight is not a better word to describe the warfare of to-day. The victims are not bound so tightly as their predecessors; principles can be, if we choose, very elastic, and have been in this instance widely stretched, till, as the bishop of London now tells us, "reasons have been found sufficient to satisfy the consciences of those who are unwilling to obey, in disobeying the bishop himself to whom obedience has been sworn, the diocesan or provincial courts in which a learned layman alone presides, and the Crown itself in last resort, advised by bishops and learned lay judges, together in Council."

We are sometimes told in answer to such objections that, had the voice of authority been heeded, the movement would have been nipped in the bud; this we can readily grant. But, we may ask, which nips the more effectually—the frost that attacks the root or the flower? The censure that destroys the spirit or the letter? From the moment that authority pronounced against the movement, its spirit died; it was the episcopal condemnation itself that killed it. If we fail to see this, it is because we confuse accident with essence, and mistake a galvanic movement for a healthy growth. Had the essence of the Tractarian movement consisted in restoring churches and organizing parishes, in adorning ministers and embellishing services, in founding sisterhoods and works of charity, even in deepening piety and arousing devotion in individuals—and is it not to triumphs of this nature that the Ritualist points?—Wesley alone had shown us how much can be done in opposition to an outside authority. But it was not for

this that the movement started—these were but accidents; the essence lay deeper and farther from the control of the originators of Tractarianism. They could and did influence individuals; but the great corporate body of the English Church was unmoved by their preaching.* She has not indeed been stationary these fifty years, but each step she has taken has but served to widen the gulf which already lay between her and the principles of 1833.

The perpetration of what latitudinarian laxity has the High Church party hindered? Could it preserve to the Anglican Church her ancient seats of learning, or her doctrine of baptismal grace, or of eternal punishment, or of the inspiration of Scripture? Could it hinder the elevation of the abettor of those who denied these last, to a seat amongst the successors of the Apostles? or prevent the scholar, whose delight it was to honour a Unitarian, from gaining the guardianship of the most interesting of her abbeys, the most beautiful of her spoils from the Catholic Church—prior only, perhaps, to seeing it thrown upon a still wider market, and scrambled for amongst the sects—a further transfer that the High Church party will be unable to hinder, should the nation will it. Even the one legal triumph of Ritualism, the Bennett judgment, when examined more closely, proves to be but the widening still further of the latitudinarianism already existing in the English Church, touching her doctrine of the Eucharist. One more contradictory “view” is thereby sheltered in the Establishment; and its advocates are now safe from legal penalties. But, where is the gain? Surely it is even less perplexing that a Church should teach a false doctrine, than that it should teach every doctrine—that we should hear both yes and no from the same voice, and taste both sweet and bitter water proceeding from one fountain.

We are not anxious to deny that, to those who look without thinking, there may be much that is attractive in a Ritualist

* Ritualists will not dispute the truth of the text. Archdeacon Denison has lately written in “Notes of my Life”:—“What then is the issue of the last fifty years? It is this—that the Establishment of England, representing for the time the Church of England, has been overcome by the world of England, and lies prostrate at its feet. I am not forgetting here, nor am I unthankful for, that revival of religion within the Establishment which has been manifested during the above period in individuals and in congregations. But of the corporate life of the Church of England, as represented by the Establishment—that life by which it stands or falls—I say, it has been overcome by the life of the world of England. The logic of facts is not to be overcome.” And again:—“The move of the Church corporate, as measured by its relations to the Civil Power—relations which lie at the door of bishops, priests, and people, quite as much as at the door of an indifferent Civil Power—is not upwards; nor, as far as I am able to see, is there any prospect of its taking that direction” (p. 373).

church and congregation. The buildings and ornaments are often beautiful, and the people are devout. Indeed, the devotion of the Ritualist party is often hardly to be distinguished from that of Catholics; its members use many of the same prayers, observe much of the same ritual, and, so far as we can judge, follow the service in the spirit of Catholics. It is even sometimes boasted that the imitation is so perfect as to surpass the original. All this is the work of fifty years' study of Catholicism; and no doubt, had the bishops been listened to, it would never have been accomplished. But now that it is accomplished, what does it profit? Is it not all like a "feast of flowers"? It gratifies a few not very wise people, as a set-off against exasperating the body of the nation.

That we do not exaggerate when we say the nation is not only still contemptuous of Catholic principles, but enraged at finding them in her midst, is clear from the circumstances under which the Public Worship Regulation Act was passed, an Act avowedly intended to "put down Ritualism." Parliament is a fairly exact mirror of national feeling; and after forty years' trial of its principles, not one voice amongst its members was bold enough to defend the party, not one vote was given to resist the effort to crush it. The very bishops of the Establishment banded themselves together to help the work, and sacrificed their jurisdiction rather than allow a Ritualist to find a chance loophole of escape in the complicated and expensive process of an antiquated law system. Facts are stubborn things, and dispel impressions. Before the year 1874, Ritualists may have believed themselves to be a power; since 1874, they must own that they have touched the nation even less than their fore-runners the Tractarians.

The chronic antagonism existing between the clergy and their bishops places Anglicans in a position which it is very difficult to defend from a Catholic standpoint, and which is a source of perplexity and positive distress to many devout people, living outside the din and excitement of the actual combat, yet not ignorant of the matter in dispute. They constantly find the observance of two Catholic duties, and often duties of practical daily importance, to be simply impossible. We may safely affirm that the casuist never yet lived who could harmonize, on a Catholic basis, the devotions and religious duties of many devout men and women now living.

However rebellious the Ritualist clergy may be, and anxious as the Ritualist laity often are to believe and act with the clergy, yet they *know* that obedience to their bishop is of the very essence of Catholicism; the stumbling-block which has proved

fatal to the many sectaries they scorn. Yet, when we come to the daily life of an English Churchman, with how many of his Catholic devotions does not the episcopal voice interfere? We need here mention but two—two, however, which are the more important as belonging to that sacramental system which he holds, and holds rightly, to be the very life of a Catholic's devotion, and of his union with God. For instance: he is fully conscious that a Christian's first need is to be cleansed from sin, and he knows that the Catholic's means to this end is the sacrament of penance, including the practice of confession to a priest. He believes in its efficiency; the gift bestowed by our Lord on His apostles he never doubts remains yet with their successors. He may have already been soothed and found grace in the healing words of absolution, and is wishful to hear them again.* But at this point there is something that arrests him. An accident has happened, an unforeseen event, a discovery—somebody has been indiscreet. Upon this a storm arises, the nation is alarmed (showing once more how little the masses are leavened by the Tractarian principles of 1833), the press is disingenuous, and the people enraged; indignation meetings are held all over the country, and confession is denounced. All this, however, touches a High Churchman not at all. He is safely entrenched within the purity of his own conscience, and can view with amazement the ignorance, and with disgust the spiteful virulence of an excited mob. God knows His own, let the heathen rage as they will, and he is content to leave all to Him. But, alas! soon, and apparently inevitably, his fathers in God bestir themselves. They are appealed to by the multitude, and one by one, as occasion offers, answer: "Confession is dangerous," says one; "Most sad in its consequences," says another; "Contrary to the spirit of the Church of England," says a third; "I can say nothing stronger in reprobation of the practice than I have already said," replies a fourth—till they unite at length in a solemn synodical condemnation of the sacrament, issued by the whole Anglican Episcopate, meeting in formal conclave and entirely untrammelled by the State. His "director" may bid a

* The text must not be supposed to support the idea that any actual forgiveness of sin or grace can be conveyed *directly* by an Anglican clergyman using a certain Catholic form of words. *Indirectly* an English Churchman may benefit, as he supposes, by the words, as a fact, by the earnestness and humility with which he has prepared himself for what he believes to be an ordinance of God, but for what in reality is merely an imitation of that ordinance—an exercise in which it is difficult to say whether the penitent or the minister is the more deceived. See Cardinal Newman's third Lecture, "The Life of the Movement not derived from the National Church," for an explanation of the working of grace outside the Catholic Church.

High Churchman slight such a serious remonstrance; yet surely it cannot but carry weight.

Once more. A practice has of late arisen in some few churches in the Establishment of celebrating daily the Anglican communion office; and so long as the number of communicants required by statute law is forthcoming, we believe authority has not felt it necessary to interfere with this practice. A natural consequence of this custom has, however, not equally escaped episcopal condemnation. We must remember that the past fifty years of endeavour to catholicize the English nation have not left it ignorant of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. It has been preached far and wide, in season and out of season. The real presence of our Lord on the altar has been insisted on, and the true efficacy of the sacrifice there offered has been loudly taught; the very Catholic phraseology is in common use, and we hear of an English clergyman "saying mass," and we hear of Anglican laymen "hearing mass." We need not be surprised that to an Anglican, who is still in perfect good faith, there should be much that is gratifying and consoling in such a service. He goes at stated times to communion, but during the interval craves for something that will touch him more intimately than the mere morning and evening service of his prayer-book; for something in which he can feel himself more at one with the wide Catholic Church outside his own little island, of which he believes his own communion to be a part; for something, too, which will link him to the past and make him feel himself one, not only with the Christian world of to-day, but one with the Church of the fathers, of the catacombs, of the Apostles. Here, too, the teaching of the Catholic Church and of antiquity seem confirmed by his experience. He is taught that his prayer, joined to the Eucharistic sacrifice, has more power with God, that his devotion has more fervour and efficacy, and he owns that so it is. Imagination can do so much, can even force a fancied reality into shadows, and bring forth solid results from the veriest of shams. He seems to grow week by week in grace, in self-conquest, in love of God and of his neighbour; and this growth he ascribes to the daily office he attends. He could be so happy, would the bishops but allow him! But here again the episcopal voice comes with warning tones, if not to arrest the custom, at any rate to disquiet the conscience. It would be simply tedious to enumerate the many episcopal censures of what is termed "non-communicating attendance." One which has appeared very lately in the Bishop of London's charge will suffice. Amongst tracts and books of devotion sown broadcast, and which he fears are undermining the more orthodox teaching of his clergy, he mentions, only to condemn, such as teach—"There

(on the altar) He is specially adored . . . uttered in such Presence and while the Eucharistic sacrifice is being offered, prayer has a more prevailing efficacy; and attendance at holy communion, though without communicating, is the highest act of Christian worship."

All this the poor Anglican feels to be so true—doctors and fathers, liturgies and hymns, agree that it is true—but his bishop tells him it is heresy; and details all his consolations and experiences only to condemn him and to warn others.

Are not these instances in which it may truly be said, Catholic duties clash? Nor is it obvious which has the better claim to be considered a good Catholic—the Anglican who "hears mass" and goes to confession, or he who, in obedience to his bishop, abstains from both. The merit of Ritualism is to raise up as the ideal of its disciples the system of the Catholic Church, its discipline and devotions. The demerit of the Church of which it forms a fraction, is to crush this ideal at every turning; to stay the natural conclusion of every premise; to grant, perhaps grudgingly, still to grant, a doctrine, only to stifle the devotion which is its natural development. As Cardinal Newman says: "No member of the Establishment can believe in any *system* of theology without doing violence to the formularies. Those only go easily along articles and prayer-book who do not *think*" ("Anglican Difficulties," p. 25).

This was true of the members of the Establishment as Cardinal Newman knew them. But a different system obtains now, one for which the early Tractarians had hardly sufficient audacity, and which constitutes another essential difference between the High Churchman of the Tracts and the Ritualist of to-day. We refer to the manner in which the letter of the Prayer-book is handled.

No doubt in 1833 the great body of the English clergy fell far short of observing the plainest directions of the Prayer-book, and one effect of the High Church movement has been a marked improvement in this respect: we have no wish to grudge this small triumph to the High Churchmen who have remained in the Establishment. Had the Ritualists been content with observing the literal directions of their formularies, none could have complained. But there exists at present a practice of adding to, of reading forced meanings into,* of what is called "supplementing

* As an example, we may instance an argument which the Ritualist's organ, the *Church Times* (August 15, 1879), put forward when defending the custom of using wafer bread in the Anglican communion service. A clergyman was condemned for the practice in a law court, as the wording of the rubric in the prayer-book is distinct: "it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten." To this the *Church Times* gravely replies

the Prayer-book from ancient sources," which seems even less defensible than the neglect of fifty years ago. The Ritualist maintains that the Prayer-book is the minimum of obligation, and he claims the liberty to enlarge on it in any and every direction as his Catholic proclivities may lead him. This at least you must grant him, for his public ministrations in the fabrics actually belonging to the nation. For his semi-private functions in the chapels belonging to sisterhoods, schools, and charitable institutions, he insists on still greater license; and so long as certain devout and excellent women are gratified, every law of Church or State, canonical or parliamentary, seems unheeded. The result of this principle is, that even in public the letter of the Prayer-book is often painfully strained and sometimes disregarded; and that unauthorized services have been introduced. We need only mention as an instance of this, the public consecration in a parish church of oil on Maundy Thursday by seven clergymen of the Establishment.* In rubrical details, too, the positive directions of the Prayer-book are disregarded, often perhaps in points which may appear trifling in themselves, but which gain importance from the fact of their being attempts at minute imitation of that Church from which the mistress whom the Ritualist serves has deliberately cut herself off. Such, for example, are these—the point in the service at which the remains of the consecrated elements are consumed; and the manner in which some of the laity are communicated. Indeed, when we consider how absolutely he disregards both letter and spirit of the Prayer-book, we can only wonder at a Ritualist's comparative moderation in public; we are at a loss to discover what law holds him, and prevents his doing all in a church that he does in a chapel; a self-restraint which merely exposes him to the taunt of doing that in private that he dares not venture to do in public. Why should he not allow his congregation as well as his sisterhood to enjoy the privilege of worshipping (as he believes) the Blessed Sacrament reserved in a tabernacle; or deny to the former what he grants the other, the Catholic offices of Exposition, Benediction and the *Quarant'ore*, which follow naturally from the custom of

(we will not allow ourselves to believe that it considered so solemn a service a fit subject for joke)—"As if wafer-bread after all were not, as a matter of fact, 'such as is usual to be eaten'—with ices." What sense may not be put on directions, if words so foreign to the minds of their framers, may thus be added to the rubrics, and form the basis of argument and the ground of action?

* A bishop was not forthcoming, and therefore the clergy were in this instance obliged to prefer the rites of a schismatical and separated communion to those of the Catholic Church, for which last, to do them justice, when possible, they show a preference.

reservation? It really requires some self-command to write seriously of men whose consciences are so sensitive to Church law on some points and so lax on others; who will convulse the Establishment rather than give up a dress, custom, or posture which they and they alone consider obligatory, and then habitually celebrate a sacrament unknown to and unlicensed by a bishop, in an unlegalized room; who will risk their lives in a fever hospital rather than go unfasting to communicate the sick, and then reserve the sacrament in a private chapel after a fashion for which even a local Catholic bishop has no authority or power to give permission. Surely, the text of all others on which it would profit a Ritualist to meditate is, "Obedience is better than sacrifice." The battle of Copenhagen may have been a noble naval achievement; but it was not the ideal victory of a Christian minister, nor was the spirit that gained it one which is likely to make good Catholics. Apparent triumphs in a Catholic direction, won in defiance of all legitimate authority, will not really forward the cause a Ritualist has at heart.

When taxed with his irregular proceedings, it is no excuse for a Ritualist to answer that others do as bad or worse—that if he says the *Confiteor*, which he is not directed to say, a broad Churchman omits the Athanasian Creed, which he is directed to read; or that a Low Churchman says but once to a railfull of communicants words which he is ordered to repeat to each individually. What can a system be worth, the defence of which in plain terms is, "If I am bad, you are worse"? High claims make deep responsibilities. We must remember the Ritualist proclaims himself the sole authorized representative of God's Church, our Lord's Spiritual body, in England. Is it possible for such an one to banter reproaches on an equal footing with heretics and Protestants? Surely, those who go forth to battle for law and Church must themselves be free from all reproach of breaking the law or of failing the Church.

This answer is obvious and lies on the surface. Cardinal Newman, however, enunciates a theory as to the true position of the nation and the Establishment, which gives us a profound and more satisfying reason for refusing to allow the Ritualists to shelter themselves behind such a plea as the above. This theory at once adjusts much that is perplexing in the English Church, and explains the injustice of which the Ritualists complain—an injustice which we own *seems* sometimes to exist, but which vanishes at once when we have grasped the truth as to the nature and position of the religion deliberately set up in England when she cut herself adrift from the See of Peter.

In his first Lecture, Cardinal Newman tells us the Establishment is merely "one aspect of the State or mode of civil

governance." As he proceeds to prove this, many of his audience must have listened with positive pain, so clearly did he show that the ideal Church they were living in was entirely unresponded to by any outward facts, and was plainly but the mirage of their fancy. The events of the last thirty years have afforded further evidence that the explanation he then offered was a true one; many have seen the literal fulfilment of his prophecies. He foresaw them even then, when the nation had but lately awoken from its long lethargic sleep; he saw it was becoming religiously active, and he had no doubt as to the direction its activity would take.

The English are without doubt a self-governing people. Our army, our navy, our home government and our law courts exist only how and when and where the English people choose; and religion is not allowed to be an exception. God too shall be worshipped, not as He may have revealed He would be worshipped, but as the English people may think fit that He shall be worshipped; and it is at their peril that any venture to put forth abstract ideas of right and wrong in the matter. The nation knows what it wants in religion as in everything else; and what it wants it secures. Nor is it only to-day and now for the first time that the English people has itself determined the character of its religion. It began to choose for itself at the Reformation, and so it has chosen ever since; as the nation has changed, so has its Church changed. In this we find the explanation of the Catholic character of some portion of the Prayer-book. It was framed at a date when the nation was far more Catholic-minded than it is to-day; before the Protestantism which it was then embracing had done its work and leavened the people. The nation then willed a semi-patristic, semi-Protestant religion, bearing here and there a certain external resemblance to the Church it was deserting; and what the nation wanted, it got. Some Catholic doctrines were retained and others were denounced; and perhaps as long as the nation continued in its partially Catholic frame of mind, it allowed the Catholic portion of the Prayer-book to bear a Catholic sense. Indeed, those who advocated the Catholic sense were for a while strong enough to vanquish their Puritan rivals; though these in their turn have gradually and quietly supplanted their conquerors, and won a more solid, if less obvious, victory than that which terminated the warfare two hundred years ago.

The nation even now, sooner than be agitated and worried by formal religious changes, has no objection, apparently, to sanction a certain amount of Catholic teaching, as long as it lays hidden away, printed in small type, in that portion of the Prayer-book at which it never glances. But, let such teaching venture into

public and meet the nation face to face, she makes short work with it in her law courts. She created the Establishment—neither apostle, pope, nor bishop; but king, parliament, and people—and if it venture to cross her will, her only feeling towards it is that of an indignant mistress towards a rebellious slave. She pays it and pampers it; but in return, and above all things, it must be obedient.

Is not this the true explanation of the injustice with which the Ritualist complains that he is treated? We may, probably, take for granted that no body of men are in these days treated with conscious injustice. The Ritualist tells us that he is the single exception: that a Low Churchman or a Broad Churchman breaks the law unrebuked, only that the accumulated blame of all shortcomings may be vented on him. He does not realize that the master he serves cares nothing at all for the irregularities of these others, whilst abhorring what is often his own *literal* obedience. He fails to see that the average Briton dislikes, let us say, hearing a fast-day announced (an announcement he himself actually orders), and enjoys the unauthorized prayer before his sermon. He must accept the certain but unpalatable truth that, "The nation that imposes the doctrine imposes its sense;" that he cannot serve two masters, the Catholic Church and the English Establishment; and then the anomalies and injustice of which he believes himself the victim will vanish. The nation allowed certain parts of the Prayer-book to bear a Catholic character at the Reformation, because then the nation was partially Catholic-minded; but we cannot argue from then to now, and conclude that because it so acted at that date, it will act so to-day. The nation has changed and is daily changing, and is becoming more and more Protestant, and the Anglican formularies being "but the expression of the national sentiment, are necessarily modified by it." Has not the Establishment proved itself the nation's property, and are not the shiftings of the nation's belief the true basis of its teaching? It is not only in the Prayer-book that we find unrepealed yet unheeded laws and penalties; our statute books are said to abound with them. "Moralists lay down, that a law loses its authority which the lawgiver knowingly allows to be infringed and put aside; whatever, then, be the abstract claims of the Anglican cause, the fact is that the living community to which they belong has for centuries ignored and annulled them." (*"Anglican Difficulties,"* p. 16.)

If this be sound morality, is it not also common sense, and the law by which from very childhood upwards we guide our actions? Does not the youngest child, capable of reason, argue that if he does to-day openly and unrebuked what his father yesterday forbade, the original prohibition is repealed? We feel an apology

to be due to our readers for insisting on what is so obvious; our excuse is that the Ritualists have failed to catch an explanation which makes all that is obscure and unjust in their present position clear. They start with their false theory of being part of the Catholic Church, and being governed by Catholic bishops; and the result is a series of anomalies and heart-burnings, a sense of injustice and of undeserved suffering. Let them realize that the Establishment is only the religion which the nation chooses for the moment to endow, and that the bishops are merely the officers whom it chooses shall rule, and then facts and theories will correspond and their troubles will cease.

The English bishops are all but faultless as officers of the Establishment. Are they to blame if they fail in their character of "Bishops of the Catholic Church"—a character *they* lay no claim to, but which the Ritualists persist in assigning to them? Where lies the fault, if confusion is the result of this twofold view of their office? Surely, with the Ritualist, who *will* see only that in the bishops which the bishops ignore, and then blames them if they fall short of the character with which he and he alone invests them. In none of their duties as bishops of the Establishment can the Anglican episcopate be said to fail. Do they not ordain, confirm, consecrate churches, interest themselves in education, and take part in works of charity? All this and much more they do zealously. But, because they will not "pontificate at high mass," "consecrate holy oil for the sacrament of unction," "license confessors for the sacrament of penance," and sanction every other conceivable custom and rite that their formularies disallow and their people abominate—those who in theory invest them with the highest supernatural power God has bestowed on creatures, absolve themselves from the duty of following their advice or of heeding their commands.

The hope of reaching the Catholic Church whilst starting from the platform of the Establishment, is about as visionary as would be that of a traveller who wishing to go to Spain takes the road for Norway. In vain does he interpret every stray sunbeam as an approach to the south, every rare flower and tree as a forerunner of its rich vegetation; the sun will grow colder and the flowers rarer the longer he travels; till he finds himself at length hopelessly stranded on the ice-bound coasts of the north. In vain does the Ritualist sing his *Agnus Dei*, array himself in cope and chasuble, brighten his altar with candles and flowers; the nearer he flatters himself that he is approaching the Church, the further he is really receding—the bishop's condemnation becomes severer, and the penalties of the law courts become heavier, till outraged common sense and popular fury combine to consign him literally to a prison. He ruins himself without advancing his cause.

Surely the world is already sufficiently out of joint without adding one other to its anomalies. This Neo-Catholicism, the very "newest fashion in religion," though loudly proclaiming itself the oldest, whose apostles despise their bishops and are in communion with heretics; who oust a Protestant from his Church, only in their turn to be succeeded by another Protestant; who swear by authority and follow private judgment; who profess to form part of the National Church, and yet "do not follow its bishops, disown its existing traditions, are discontented with its law courts, shrink from its laity and outstrip its prayer book" (*ibid.* 140). "In some points (they) prefer Rome, in others Greece, in others England, in others Scotland; and of that preference their own private judgment is the ultimate sanction" (*ibid.* 141). To this heavy indictment, even truer to-day than it was thirty years ago, we may now add the birth of a brand-new Episcopate, hidden away in a portion of the party, coming no one knows whence, and working no one knows where; the object of which is to repair the doubtful and broken links of the Anglican succession, and from which we believe it is hoped a united Christendom will eventually come forth in the full-blown strength of oneness, and from its inherent beauty take possession of God's heritage! Truly, as Cardinal Newman says, "Life is not long enough for such trifles."

If it is asked why the Establishment yet retains in its midst a body of men so clearly antagonistic to itself, why does it suffer them to remain "cumbering with their presence what they are not allowed to serve," we believe the answer to be, because they are good to the poor and zealous in works of charity. Within certain wide limits the Establishment cares little for doctrine; but it cares very much for its people, that its starving should be fed and its naked clothed; and for this it utilizes the Ritualist whom it elsewhere disowns and despises. But it was not to train an efficient band of relieving officers that the movement of 1833 was started (though no doubt active charity is a natural outcome of Catholic teaching)—it was to reassert the lost dogmatic principle, to teach that "dogmatism which is a profession of its own reality as contrasted with other systems." That the Establishment is sufficiently latitudinarian to endeavour to retain every shade of opinion that can be induced to rest within its bosom, is nothing new. High Churchmen, in remaining Anglicans in their persons after their principles have vanished, have played its game exactly, and have helped to win the battle for the enemy they went forth to fight.

We have no need to be told that all remonstrance addressed to the Ritualist clergy is vain labour; we do not dream that where the bishops fail a periodical is likely to succeed. The clergy

are so sure they are right, that should they study these Lectures it will be not to discover where Cardinal Newman may be right, but to assure themselves how often he is wrong. But amongst the laity are there no victims whose eyes may yet be opened as to the true nature of their position? We who have escaped feel as those must feel who have been saved from drowning waters, and only just saved, leaving others still in danger. We view with sympathizing pity those still struggling in the flood, with still deeper pity those who assure us there is no struggle, that they are at peace in God's ark, and are riding safely into the haven where they would be. We feel that we cannot rest till we have pointed to the strong hand which rescued us, that we must make one effort to bring home to others Cardinal Newman's earnest and convincing words. We must also remember that a party, though to some extent owning a personality, is but a succession of units; and even if we grant that the party is one with that to which Cardinal Newman lectured, the individuals have changed. Many of those who heard his spoken words are now at rest, but the problems he helped them to solve still face each fresh generation; Anglican difficulties are as sure to arise to-day as in 1850—indeed, to High Churchmen they must be surely now even more urgent than then. Let the voice which then smoothed the road for so many, smooth it for these to-day. It is only with the hope of inducing others to look for themselves that we have ventured, on what is itself in us a presumption, to draw attention to Cardinal Newman's warning words. Our aim is merely to be a pointing road-post to these Lectures, which from experience we know are not at this date much studied by English Churchmen.

Touching this, and perhaps accounting for it, we have one more word to say. We feel sure that if an Anglican asks his clergyman's permission to read these "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties," it will be refused, for he too has his *index expurgatorius*. But before accepting his "director's" refusal as final, let him consider if it may not be based on reasoning of the following nature, and if he can or ought to submit to it:—

I began myself with doubting and inquiring, I departed from the teaching I received; I was educated in some older type of Anglicanism; in the school of Newton, Cecil or Scott, or in the Bartlett's Buildings school, or in the Liberal Whig school. I was a Dissenter, or a Wesleyan, and by study and thought I became an Anglo-Catholic, and then I read the Fathers, and I have determined what works are genuine, and what are not; which of them apply to all times, and which are occasional; which historical and which doctrinal; what opinions are private, what authoritative; what they only seem to hold, what they ought to hold; what are fundamental, and what ornamental.

Having thus measured and cut and put together my creed by my own proper intellect, by my own lucubrations, and *differing from the whole world in my results*, I distinctly bid you, I solemnly warn you, not to do as I have done, but to accept what I have found, to revere that, to believe that, for it is the teaching of the old Fathers, and of your Mother the Church of England. Take my word for it, that this is the very truth of Christ ("Lectures on Anglican Difficulties" p. 142).

Would his obedience be evidence of his oneness with the movement of 1833? Ought he not rather to ask himself, with Cardinal Newman, "whether a party formed on such principles can in any sense be called a genuine continuation of the Apostolic party of (fifty) years ago. The basis of that party was the professed abnegation of private judgment". . . . the Ritualist "is the professed exercise of it." Is he content to acquiesce in this, for he cannot deny it? Will he not rather follow his first principles to their one legitimate conclusion, abandon shadows for realities, exchange the city of strife for the "true home of souls and the valley of peace," and again be one with those "who are so full of joy they wish all around them to be partakers of it."

Is it possible that there is a resurrection even upon earth that the severed shall unite? Look at us, my brethren, from our glorious land; look on us radiant with the light cast upon us by the saints and angels who stand over us; gaze on us as you approach and kindle as you gaze. We died, you thought us dead—we live; we cannot return to you, you must come to us *and you are coming.*

Since the above paper on "Anglican Difficulties" by Cardinal Newman was written, the attention of the writer has been directed to two other volumes which are named at the head of this article. The first-mentioned, by Abbé Martin, has only just been issued from the press; the second, by Dr. Lee, has been before the world for a year. Both books, however, in their several ways, are works of importance in the present controversy with Anglicanism, and are works of value in themselves. They are noticed in another part of this number. It is also proposed that they shall form, with other cognate volumes, the basis of a more minute and careful analysis in the following number in April next.

In the meantime, we hasten to express the gratitude of all Catholics to Abbé Martin for the reprint of his searching and scholarly articles from the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Contemporary Review*, supplemented as they have been by other original essays. And we wish also to express the satisfaction which Catholics must feel at the publicity once more given, or for the

first time directed, to the revelations contained in Dr. Lee's volumes—and that from a source beyond suspicion—upon the early history and avowed principles of the Anglican Reformation.

One remark is applicable to both these volumes. Few persons who were not previously acquainted with the name of either author, his position or his nationality, would probably discover that the one was a distinguished French abbé and professor, and that the other was an accomplished parochial clergyman of the Established religion. The minute and in general the accurate knowledge which the French ecclesiastic displays of the past history and present condition, not of a sister Church, but of a small section of one party in a severed and heretical body, is surprising to anyone who may have watched the career of the Ritualistic movement. The frank candour and the critical freedom with which the Anglican incumbent exposes the secrets and displays the falsities of his own communion, is, if perhaps we except Dr. Littledale's well-known Lecture on his spiritual Fathers, the English Reformers, without a parallel. In these aspects the two books are perhaps unique.

One question may be asked in regard to both volumes. Will those who ought to be most deeply interested in the books, and who are most gravely compromised by them, read these contributions towards the Anglican controversy by Abbé Martin and Dr. Lee? The answer may be given, with conditional emphasis, *Certainly not*, if the organs of the High Church party and its foremost members can prevent it, whether by ignoring the volumes in public, or by forbidding those whom they can privately control from studying them. Fortunately for both authors, they appeal to a wider constituency than the narrow limits of the Ritualistic school of thought; and we therefore hope that they will be widely read and pondered.

ART. V.—THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN THE UNITED STATES.

IT is not the social instinct alone which causes man to take delight in being one of a multitude. His self-importance is heightened when he contemplates himself in association with millions of his fellow-beings. To be a great man in a little country is like being famous in one's own village. Nowhere is this delight in numbers keener than in the United States. The marvellous growth of our population is a theme of which we do not weary. The unexampled rapidity of the increase is doubtless

one reason why it is found to be interesting; another is the fact that ours is a government by numbers, in which majorities rule. It is no ordinary thing to have grown within a century from 3,000,000 to 50,000,000 of people. The circumstances which have made this possible certainly seem to be favourable to human life and happiness. Populousness is as pleasing to the Catholics of the United States as to other Americans. They are proud of the growth of their country, and of the spread of their faith, which has been even more rapid than the general increase of population. The little flock of 25,000 has become, within a century, a great fold, whose numbers are counted by millions. No one had dreamed of such progress, but now that it is a fact we turn from it to something higher. We are numerous enough to be able to perceive that numbers do not suffice; that it is possible to be as populous as China and yet to be effete.

The increase of Catholics in the United States is due chiefly to immigration; and hence a casual view leaves the impression that there is here no real gain, but merely a change of domicile. There is, however, much more than this, and the actual condition of Catholicism in the United States is the outcome of struggles and triumphs which will ever remain memorable in the history of the Church. The British Colonies of North America were dedicated to Protestantism. All the forces by which public thought and sentiment are moulded were antagonistic to the Catholic faith. The successful issue of the War of Independence heightened the self-consciousness of the Americans. They were a new people in a new world, destined to create a new civilization, and they inevitably fell a prey to the ignorances and delusions of the young. They saw no good in the past, and looked with contempt upon the Old World and its ways. Their political opinions intensified their religious prejudices. They hated the Catholic faith, not only because they thought it a degrading superstition, but not less because in their minds it was associated with the abuses and tyrannies of the Governments of Europe. Its antiquity was only a reason for thinking it false and obsolete, its imperial organization was an argument to prove its incompatibility with republican institutions, and its symbolical worship was but the plain revelation of its idolatrous character. So that from whatever point of view this new people looked at the old Church they could discern in it only an unsightly ruin, given over to decay and become the habitation of doleful creatures.

That the Church, in the face of such opposition, should have been able to assert herself at all, is certainly an evidence of remarkable vigour; but that she should have grown in a single century to be the most numerous, the most thoroughly organized,

and the strongest religious body in the United States, is little less than marvellous. Still more surprising is it that this progress should be coeval with the decay and disintegration of American Protestantism. There are not less than 7,000,000 Catholics in the United States, and the numbers of all the Protestant sects are reckoned at about six millions. The Protestant masses have fallen away from active communion with the churches in which their fathers believed, and are in a state of religious indifference which is scarcely distinguishable from infidelity. And among those who belong to the various denominations there is observable a constant approach to habits of thought and sentiment that are less and less Christian. Dogmatic faith seems to have lost all hold upon them, and hence the authority of the churches in doctrinal matters is simply ignored. An eloquent preacher in any of our great cities may not only defy his sect with impunity but is sure to gain popularity and influence by his rebellion. Religious doctrines are held to be matters of opinion about which nothing can be certainly known, and hence no importance whatever is attached to them. The teaching of such doctrines in the public schools is strictly prohibited; and this feature of the common school system is, in the eyes of the people, its chief merit. Each generation, as it issues forth from these schools, is less Christian, the descent to mere secularism is rapid, and nowhere is there manifest any serious disposition to return to the creeds of the Protestant sects.

That the position of the Catholic Church in the United States is altogether more favourable there can be no doubt. Her growth is rapid, and her losses comparatively few. Nowhere is the authority of the Pope more respected and nowhere is greater liberty of action granted to the bishops. Our grievance is the school question. We are taxed for a kind of education of which we cannot avail ourselves. Apart from this our freedom is perfect. The traditional prejudices are disappearing, and a very considerable portion of the American people are quite as friendly to Catholics as to Presbyterians or Methodists. They believe in freedom, and if freedom proves to be on the side of the Church, it is not probable that in this country public opinion will appeal to tyranny. To dwell at length, however, upon what is consoling in the state of the Church in America would be foreign to the purpose of the present writing, and we must address ourselves to a less pleasant task.

When we contrast the Church with the sects we are filled with confidence, but when we consider her condition without reference to the surrounding religious organizations, our eyes are opened to the existence of many evils and even grave dangers. Fortunately we are strong enough to bear the sight of our weak-

nesses. For half a century after the close of the War of Independence observant minds were in doubt as to what would be the outcome of the efforts to build up the Church in this country. The bishops and priests, few and scattered, were overwhelmed by the incoming tide of immigration, and were wholly unable to provide for the spiritual wants of the ever-increasing multitudes of Catholics, who spread throughout the land and settled down in the midst of Protestant populations. Thousands died from exposure, and their children were lost to the Church; other thousands, deprived of the sacraments, sank into indifference, and their descendants soon forgot that their fathers had been Catholics. Where a congregation was gathered together, the intermingling of different nationalities generally produced discord, and the priest, who was often alike ignorant of the character of the people and their language, was powerless to make the spirit of Christian charity prevail. Indeed, he was himself, in many instances, turbulent and insubordinate. The authority of the bishops was weak and uncertain. The laity showed a disposition to hold the title to the property of the Church, and thus virtually to keep in their own hands the appointment of pastors. The Catholics were, for the most part, poor and uneducated, and their troubles and sorrows only served to confirm the Americans in their traditional prejudices against their faith. Their leaders were brave men, but, in the midst of such trials, they could not look to the future with great confidence. Bishop England, whose boundless energy and sanguine temperament should have inspired hope, yielded to gloomy thoughts and even exaggerated our losses.

The days of this discouragement have been left far behind; but it is not to be imagined that the bad effects of those evil times have all disappeared. Much has been done for primary and secondary education, but nothing at all to promote Catholic culture of the higher sort. Schools and colleges have multiplied an hundred-fold, but the quality and degree of education is hardly higher than it was fifty years ago. The number of priests has grown within half a century from two hundred and thirty to six thousand, and yet the number of really able men in the Church was probably not only relatively but absolutely greater at the beginning than at the end of this period. The intellectual training given in our seminaries, which are probably very like the same class of institutions in Europe, is of the most elementary kind. It fits young men for the routine work of the ministry, and this may be all that the most of them should be expected to do; but, if we are to take part in moulding and directing the thought of the age, a higher and more thorough mental culture must be provided for those at least whose natural endowments

are excellent. This cannot be done by adding another year to the ordinary seminary course; nor can it be hoped for from an American college in Rome, or Louvain, or elsewhere in Europe. It is well that the elementary course of theology should be lengthened to four years; and it is altogether proper that we should have a college in Rome; but it is a fatal mistake to imagine that nothing more is required in order to raise the standard of clerical education in this country to a height which will enable us to take a respectable part in the living controversies of the day. In order to do this we must create upon our own soil a centre of intellectual life and culture. There is here a great people, whose thought is eager and intense, whose character is well-defined, whose activity is boundless, whose institutions are the natural outcome of social conditions which are not found elsewhere. There is a disposition to call all things in question and to look at nothing from ancient points of view. There may be few among us who have the best education, but nowhere else are there so many who are quickwitted and intelligent, and nowhere else is there such blind faith in mental culture. The people tax themselves for the maintenance of the common schools; and no other tax is supported by such overwhelming public favour. There may be said to be a kind of common consent among Americans that the best use which can be made of money is to employ it to diffuse knowledge and to strengthen and sharpen the intellect; though it must be confessed that, when the intellect is sharpened, this same common consent seems to be unable to find any higher work for it than money-making. No form of benevolence is so popular here as the founding of colleges and the endowments of chairs of learning. Benefactions of this kind among non-Catholic Americans are often of a princely character, and all that money can do to create centres of high culture and science is being done by them. Hence they have institutions which, if not yet fully equipped as true universities, are making constant approaches to such an ideal. In this matter the Catholics of the United States have done little or nothing. There is not even the beginning of a Catholic University, though, in the absence of the real thing, several Latin Schools have taken occasion to assume the name. In consequence, American Catholic literature remains inferior; our writers are few and second-rate; our participation in the highest thought of the country is nominal or casual; and our apologists still wander over the waste places of Protestant controversy and rattle the dry bones of a sectarianism that is long since dead. The impossibility of obtaining the best education in which the Catholics of this country are placed is not, however, the most serious evil from which they suffer. If the condition of our people in other respects were

satisfactory, there can be no question but a University would very quickly be created; and so long as this condition remains unchanged it is not probable that anything could save the Church from very serious losses in the United States.

The great bulk of our population is crowded into the large cities and industrial centres, while comparatively few are engaged in agriculture. The Catholic farmers of the United States do not equal in numbers the Catholic population of the city of New York alone. Only about eighty in every thousand of our Irish Catholics cultivate the soil; the remaining nine hundred and twenty are living in the great cities, or the factory towns, or the mining districts, or are in the employ of the railway companies, or are engaged in some other kind of service. The proportion of German farmers is somewhat greater, but the masses of the German Catholics are also in the cities and the towns. Among the French and Italians who emigrate to this country, a farmer is almost as rare as among the Jews. Even the Canadian Catholics, an agricultural people at home, huddle together in the factory towns when they come to the United States. The masses of the Bohemian immigrants are congregated in the Western cities, and are already infected with Socialism. The Poles, too, are chiefly in the cities or in the mines.

Is it well for the Church in this country that the Catholics are massed together in the principal centres of population? It is not to be denied that she has thereby gained certain immediate advantages, more or less real. This circumstance has brought her more prominently before the public, it has enabled her to build more costly and showy religious edifices, it has placed the devotion and zeal of the Catholic peasantry of Europe in strong contrast with the coldness and indifference of the Protestants of our American cities. The surging multitudes that fill the Catholic churches of New York four and five times on Sunday were trained to this religiousness while, in far-off lands, they knelt around rustic chapels, and kept alive under the thatch-roofed cottage the ancient traditions of purity and reverence. Their faith and earnestness are most certainly not attributable to their present surroundings; they are the result of their past history and not of this actual mode of life; and, if the influences to which they are now subject are unfavourable to the preservation of these virtues, it is small compensation for such loss that the Church has acquired a momentary prominence. She builds for eternity and not for the passing hour. Her interests are identified with the welfare of her children, and what is hurtful to them cannot be good for her.

Now, in a country like this, where it has been, and is still,

easy for even a poor man to get a farm of his own, only some fatal and inexplicable blindness could have kept the multitude of Catholic immigrants in the cities and towns, where they and their children are condemned to drudgery and hired service and are exposed to dangers to which great numbers of them must inevitably fall a prey.

The life of a farmer is more conducive to religion and morality than that of an operative; it is more healthful, it is more independent, it is more conservative, more equable, less exposed to temptation. In the country the family life has a sacredness of its own, and its sanctity is protected by special safeguards which are denied to the poor in cities. Ancestral traditions are handed down from father to son, and ancient manners—sure defence of wholesome laws—are held in reverence. The voice of God's minister is more distinctly heard and more willingly obeyed. "The growth of cities," says Buckle, "has been a main cause of the decline of ecclesiastical power." "The city population of France," says Michelet, "which is but one-fifth of the nation, furnishes two-fifths of the criminals." Special causes have depressed the moral character of the lower agricultural classes in England, but their superior morality elsewhere, both in Europe and America, is undeniable. The percentage of illegitimacy in the city is double that in the country, and in the matter of divorces the same proportion holds good, while the city is notoriously the hotbed of prostitution and drunkenness. The number of suicides among the industrial classes is nearly twice that of farming populations.

This moral decay has as its concomitant physical deterioration, and, as a consequence of the one and the other, there is a diminished frequency and fruitfulness of marriage, which, were it not for the constant intermingling of country blood, would necessarily result in the extinction of the industrial classes.

Now, it is to these classes that three-fourths of the Catholics of the United States belong, and the evils peculiar to this mode of life are felt by them in an exceptionally great degree. The old saying, "*Qui trans mare currunt, coelum, non animum mutant*," is not true of the multitudes who leave Europe to come to America. The change which comes over their thoughts and sentiments is generally greater than the difference of climate between the New and the Old World; and sudden changes of this kind are critical. It is trying to the moral and religious character to break up old associations, for they are interwoven with habits of thought and action which are a very part of ourselves. Those who sever ties of country and home, but continue in some other part of the world to lead the life to which they have hitherto been accustomed, must be of the better sort if they

do not suffer some injury from the change; and the risk of degeneracy is necessarily greatly increased when in a strange land they enter upon a mode of life for which they are wholly unprepared. And this is what has happened to the masses of our Catholics here in America. In Europe they were peasants, simple-minded, frugal and reverent; and landing here they are plunged into the excitement and turmoil of a corrupt city. They are spellbound by the eager reckless life around them, and, when they find that they can get employment at good wages, they rent a room in a tenement-house and take no thought for the future. "I deliberately assert," said one who had made a careful study of the subject,

That it is not within the power of language to describe adequately, much less to exaggerate, the evil consequences of this unhappy tendency of the Irish to congregate in the large towns of America. . . . It is easy enough to explain why and how those who should not have remained in the great cities, did so; but it is not easy to depict the evils which have flowed, which daily flow, which, unhappily for the race, must continue to flow, from the pernicious tendency of the Irish peasant to adopt a mode of livelihood for which he is not suited by previous knowledge or training, and to place himself in a position dangerous to his morals, if not fatal to his independence.*

And we may with equal truth apply this language to the German, Italian, Bohemian, Polish, and Canadian Catholics who have emigrated to the United States. The greater part of all of them have settled down where they and their children are most exposed to dangers and evils of every kind. In New York, Boston, Providence, and other American cities, the Catholics are the poorer classes; they live in squalid quarters, in overcrowded and unhealthy tenements, in which the privacy of family life is destroyed and the influence of the parents over their children is greatly weakened. These children, for the most part, frequent the common schools, and are trained to religious indifference; others go to Catholic schools, but the class-room can effect little when its lessons are counteracted by home example and the associations of the street. The parents have no power to select their children's playmates, and warnings against the dan evil company are almost meaningless in neighbourhoods where the virtuous and the depraved are necessarily intermingled. The young are all taught to read; and nowhere else is such abominable stuff prepared for the exercise of this capacity. They cannot remain in their overcrowded rooms, and on the street they are made acquainted already in their tender years with every form of sin. The rum-shop and the drunkard are on every corner, the

* The late John Francis Maguire, in his "Irish in America."

dance-house is not far away, blasphemy and obscenity are in the air, and the white bloom of innocence loses its freshness and fragrance, like a delicate flower in a frosty night.

Many other causes of ruin, to which the poor are especially exposed, exist in our American cities. The political contests, which are carried on by bribery and by appeals to ignorance and passion, are a never-failing source of demoralization. Then the labour associations and trades-unions, in which the Catholics are largely represented, generally exert a harmful influence upon their members. They tend to create hatred and envy, they destroy contentment and faith in the power of persevering industry, and fill the minds of the poor with visionary schemes of reform, which partake more or less of the character of Socialism. The trades-union little by little supplants the Church. The periodical strikes, also, together with the enforced idleness and want which accompany them, are occasions of ruin to thousands of Catholics in the manufacturing and mining districts. It is unnecessary, however, to dwell upon the dangers to which the industrial classes are exposed, or to describe the miseries of the life to which they are condemned, but it may be well, in this connection, to quote the words of Dr. Engel, Director of the Royal Statistical Bureau of Berlin, who is an authority in such matters :

This (he says) is the judgment passed upon the modern industrial system, especially as it exists in great cities, by the most enlightened statesmen and by others who are most thoroughly acquainted with society as now constituted:—it is, in spite of the philanthropic efforts of individuals and the heroic endeavours of many employers, the immolation of human beings to Capital—a consumption of men which, by the wasting of the vital forces of individuals, by the weakening of whole generations, by the breaking up of families, by the ruin of morality and the destruction of the joyousness of work, has brought the civilized world into the most imminent peril.*

The condition of the great body of the Catholics of England is doubtless very similar to that in which the Catholics of the United States are placed. They, too, live almost exclusively in the great commercial and manufacturing centres, and are victims on the altar of Moloch. But for them there is no alternative so long as they desire to make England their home, and their sufferings attract less attention because they are inevitable. Something, indeed, can be done by employers and by legislation to improve the lot of the factory slave ; but when the utmost has been done he is still unfortunate, for misery is inseparable from the mode of life to which industrial populations are condemned.

* "Jahrbuch Berlin's von 1868."

In the United States this problem presents itself under more favourable conditions. Here, those who sympathize with the poor do not find themselves restricted to measures of relief that are merely palliative; for on this side of the Atlantic a Land of Promise is yet within the reach of the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. And it is the knowledge of this fact that has led to the Catholic colonization movement, the object of which is to encourage and promote the settlement of Catholics upon the cheap lands of the United States. The Americans are a nation of colonizers, sprung from colonists, and developed into a mighty people through the power of a great and wise system of internal colonization. The policy of the Government, the interests of the country, the spirit of the people, and the character of the climate and soil, all combine to ensure the success of undertakings of this kind. We are a nation of farmers, and the growth of a farming population, of whatever race or religious belief, has never excited public suspicion or jealousy, but has, on the contrary, invariably met with approval. If the Mormons are tolerated it is because they are farmers who have brought the desert under cultivation. The rapidity and extent of our agricultural progress are without a parallel in the world's history. The ten States now known as the Western States, with a population of over 17,000,000, were, at the beginning of the present century, unbroken prairies and primeval forests. The annual value of their farm products is now \$1,500,000,000. Their average annual yield is 950,000,000 bushels of corn and 231,000,000 bushels of wheat. This stupendous agricultural development, which has affected the markets of the world, is the work of the last thirty or forty years. These fertile lands were to be had for nothing, or at a nominal price, when the Catholics of Ireland began to pour into the United States. It would have been easy then to found great Catholic agricultural communities in Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa; but the golden opportunity was allowed to pass by unused, while the immigrants remained huddled together in the tenement-houses of New York and in the factory towns of New England, or were employed to build railroads or dig canals. And now, in these wealthy and populous States, they own only patches of land here and there. Half of the Irish Catholics of Illinois are in Chicago, and are in no better condition than if they had settled in New York or Boston; and there is no present prospect that any considerable portion of the land of this State will ever be owned by Catholics. It is not possible to think of these lost opportunities without bitterness of soul; but, even while we think, other opportunities of the same kind are passing away. The States and Territories farther to the west are rapidly filling up. During the last

six years two millions of people have left the older States to seek homes on the cheap lands of the Far West. From 1875 to 1878 Kansas alone received 200,000 immigrants; and in Nebraska over 2,000,000 acres of Government land have been taken up during the last three years. For the year ending June 20, 1878, the General Land Office of the United States disposed of 7,166,974 acres; and for the twelve months ending June 30, 1879, 8,650,119 acres of Government lands passed into the hands of settlers. If to this we add the millions of acres which, during the same period, have been sold by the great railway companies, we shall be able to form an idea of the mighty movement of population which is rapidly filling up the newer States and the Territories of the American Republic. An impetus was given to this movement by the commercial crisis of 1873. The misery brought upon the labouring classes of the cities and towns, by the loss of work or the lowering of wages, directed the attention of great numbers to the cheap lands of the West; and since the Catholics are largely represented in these classes, many of them were inevitably drawn into this westerly current, and made settlements in Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, and other States. This movement, as a matter of course, met with encouragement from the Western Bishops, who were happy to see the fertile lands of their new and thinly-peopled dioceses pass into the hands of Catholics. They hastened not merely to provide for their spiritual wants, but in several instances also took practical measures to promote colonization. It has been the policy of the Government to make land grants to financial corporations as an inducement to build railways in unsettled parts of the country, and it is upon these lands chiefly that the recent Catholic colonies have been established. The companies sell these lands at from two to five dollars an acre and allow six or seven years for payment. The railroad brings the settlers within reach of a market, so that there is never any difficulty in disposing of the products of their farms. The country is an open prairie, gently undulating and very fertile. There are no trees to be felled, no roads to be built, and what is known as the "Herd Law" does away with the need of fences. The cost of a cottage sufficient to accommodate a family is from \$100 to \$300. The farming is of such a simple character that little skill is required to do the work, the chief products being wheat and corn. The new settler is generally able to raise, even the first year, enough to supply his wants. The climate is healthful, the death-rate in Minnesota, Nebraska, and Dakota being probably lower than in any other part of the country. These Catholic colonies are invariably under the direction of a priest, chosen for his aptitude for such work. He is on the ground to receive the first settler, and the first building erected

is the church. Disputes concerning titles and bounds are rare, thanks to the admirable land-survey of the Government. A mile square is a section which contains 640 acres, and the land is sold in sections, half-sections, and quarter-sections: the amount generally taken by the poorer colonists being a quarter-section or 160 acres. In order to begin with a fair prospect of success, the settler should have from \$300 to \$500, though there are many examples which go to show that courageous and energetic persons may succeed with less and even when they commence in absolute destitution. In travelling through the colonies one meets with individuals who some three years ago arrived without anything, and who now own a farm and a comfortable dwelling free of debt. But cases of this kind are necessarily exceptional. A single crop often sells for more than the entire cost of the land. An acre which costs, say five dollars, will raise from fifteen to twenty-five bushels of wheat, worth from seventy-five cents to a dollar a bushel. All the Catholic colonies of the Western States are in a prosperous condition, and it has been stated on the best authority that in Minnesota not one per cent. of the settlers have abandoned their farms: and this will doubtless also hold good in the other states. This is the more remarkable from the fact that many of the colonists have come from the Eastern cities, the factory towns, and the mines, and have never before, or not for years, lived in the country. The "Irish Catholic Colonization Association of the United States," which was organized about a year-and-a-half ago, has already done much to extend and strengthen this movement. This is a joint-stock company, with a capital of \$100,000, which has so far founded two colonies, in Minnesota and Nebraska. This, however, is the least part of the good it has accomplished. It has brought the subject of colonization before the Catholic public of this country in a very effective manner. The organization itself is in fact the best advertisement of the work, composed as it is of archbishops, bishops, priests, and prominent Catholic laymen. It has caused public meetings to be held in many of the cities and towns of the country for the purpose of awakening an interest in the movement among the masses, and as a result the question has been treated of in pamphlets, reviews, and newspapers. The Catholic press especially has taken up the advocacy of the good cause with zeal. Through its central office in Chicago the Association is prepared to give full and trustworthy information concerning available land in all parts of the country, and to answer all questions as to climate, soil, crops, cost of settlement, and other points, which emigrants may desire to investigate before making choice of a home. The attention of Catholics in Europe even has been attracted, and as

a result a Belgian colony has been begun in Minnesota. An Irish Catholic gentleman also has bought 20,000 acres of land in the same State, upon which he is founding a colony organized upon the plan adopted by the Association. Probably the greatest service which this joint-stock company has rendered to the cause of colonization is to be found in the practical demonstration that capital may be safely and profitably invested in this good work, and if this feature could be properly shown to the wealthy Catholics of Europe, there would doubtless be no difficulty in getting them to put money into enterprises of this kind.

To encourage Catholics to emigrate from Europe to America is, however, not a purpose of the Association; nor is it the opinion, it would seem, of its directors that efforts of this kind are desirable. They are, to say the least, uncalled-for, since this country must necessarily, for many years yet, be the chief goal of those who are tired of Europe. From September, 1879, to September, 1880, 457,257 immigrants arrived in the United States, which is the highest number ever reached in our history, with the single exception of 1873. Of the immigrants who landed during the past year 144,876 came from Great Britain and Ireland; 99,706 from British America and Canada; 84,638 from Germany; 12,904 from Austria; 12,329 from Italy; 6,156 from Switzerland; 4,373 from Hungary; 4,313 from France; 2,177 from Poland; and it is consequently evident that a very large proportion are Catholics. These migrations are too vast to be affected by the efforts of individuals or associations. Concerted action of the Governments of Europe, were it possible, could do little more than retard for the moment this flight of countless multitudes from home and country and all that men are supposed to cherish most tenderly. That those who value the soul above everything else should look with sorrow upon this scene is not strange; but to seek to stop the on-rush by depicting the ruin and danger to which the faith and morals of the emigrants are exposed in this new world is a hopeless task. Nowhere has the priest more authority than in Ireland, and the priests of Ireland uniformly discourage emigration to this country; but to no purpose. And yet, with the facts before their eyes, it is not easy to see what other course was open to them; for they saw that the masses of their countrymen stopped in the cities, and it was plain that in New York and the factory towns of New England, as in London and Liverpool, multitudes of Irish Catholics were more hopelessly miserable and abandoned than it was possible for them to be even in the worst parts of Connaught.

If the Catholics of Europe are to continue to pour into America only to sink into the squalid quarters of the cities and towns,

the loss there will not be a gain here; and yet there can be no question but this immigration will increase rather than diminish. It is not possible to check it, but is it not possible to guide it and turn it into proper channels? This is a question which does not concern us here in the United States alone, it is of moment to the whole Church; and if efficacious means are to be devised to give a right direction to Catholic emigration, the Church in Europe must co-operate with the Church in America. The work of preparation, which is the most important, can be done only in the countries from which the emigrants come. In communities where large numbers annually go forth to seek homes in distant lands, the pulpit could hardly take up a more religious or opportune theme than that of colonization. In fact, the best way to diminish emigration would be to show the fatal consequences of acting blindly and thoughtlessly in so important a matter. Thousands who have gone to ruin in the cities would have sought homes in the country had they known, upon their first arrival, of our homestead laws, which give 80 or 160 acres of land to actual settlers who declare their intention of becoming citizens, or had they been made acquainted with the favourable terms upon which the cheap railroad lands may be bought. The Scandinavians, in spite of poverty and ignorance of the language, have taken advantage of these opportunities, and the masses of them are already prosperous and independent farmers. Our people would have acted in a similar manner had they not been permitted to land here in total ignorance of what it was best for them to do. Those who have made their way to the cheap lands have generally been led thither by accident rather than from a knowledge of their own interests. They followed, as labourers, the railway lines and the canals, and when the work was finished they not unfrequently found themselves in fertile regions where homes were to be had almost for the asking, and so made use of the opportunities which chance had brought in their way. If the consequences of this ignorance affected merely the temporal welfare of the people the evil would still be grave enough; but this is the least harm that results from the lack of guidance in the selection of homes and occupations by the Catholic emigrants that flock to the United States. The dangers to which they are exposed in the cities, where the masses of them remain, have already been pointed out; and those who have settled upon the land have, in innumerable instances, from want of proper direction, placed themselves and their children in the midst of surroundings in which the loss of faith is almost inevitable. As there were no Catholic colonies, and only here and there a Catholic community of farmers, the emigrants who went in search of land took it wherever they got it

on the most favourable conditions; and only when too late came to realize that they had placed themselves beyond the reach of priest and Church. In this way, isolated Catholic families, or groups of families, too small to be able to build a church or support a priest, have been scattered throughout the whole Western country, and have almost invariably fallen into total religious indifference or strayed into the Protestant sects. The parents, indeed, rarely became Protestant, but the children, brought up in complete ignorance of Catholic faith, fall an easy prey to the spirit of proselytism. They also necessarily intermarry with Protestants. Mixed marriages—which are unquestionably a chief source of loss to the Church in this country—are inevitable in communities where a few Catholics dwell in the midst of large numbers of Protestants; and they must be numerous also in cities and towns where people of different faiths are thrown together and intermingled. But in the Catholic colonies such unions will be rare, and when formed will be less dangerous on account of the predominant Catholic spirit of the surrounding society. Nor is this merely an inference: it is confirmed by the history of the descendants of the Catholic colonists of Maryland, who, in their progress towards the newer States of the Union, have held together and formed communities of their own, in which mixed marriages are exceptional, and very frequently lead to the conversion of the Protestant party.

There is yet another consideration which shows how intimately the subject of colonization is connected with the progress of the Church in this country. Among Catholics there is no longer any question as to the vital importance of religious education. Upon this, more than upon any other one human influence, the future of the Church depends. In America the schools provided by the State, for the maintenance of which Catholics are taxed, do not furnish such education, and there is no reason to think that, in our day at least, the present system will be changed. The building and support of Catholic schools is consequently attended with special difficulties, so that many even of the large parishes of the cities have hitherto been, and are still it would seem, unable to undertake this work. Now, if there is any one class that more than another stands in need of thorough religious school training, it is the children of the poor who live in cities and in manufacturing towns; for they, as a class, are deprived more than others of those home influences which are more powerful than all else to fill the soul with faith and reverence, and at the same time they are exposed more than others to evil example, which is so fatal to the innocence of the young. But the arguments which go to show how indispensable in the case of such children religious schools are, prove also that but little good

can be hoped for even from the best schools, when the home-influence, which precedes and interpenetrates the process of school instruction, is not favourable to virtue and intelligence. It is a delusion to believe that the children of people who have no homes can be rightly educated in any kind of school. The education that moulds character is given by the family, and a home is as indispensable to the family as is a sanctuary to religion. But the poor in our cities and factory towns have no homes, for lodging-houses where people eat and sleep are not homes; hired rooms which are changed from year to year, and often from month to month, are not homes. One must hope against hope to feel any confidence that the children of this floating population can be saved if they are only sent for a few years to parochial schools. They may do well enough up to the age of twelve or thirteen years, while they are preparing for first Communion and Confirmation, but what is to become of them when, with a little world-knowledge and feeble habits of virtue, they leave the classroom to enter the workshop, or the factory mill? They will almost fatally fall into evil company and be led along the easy descent until they are made the helpless victims of vice. For the young men especially, the street and the cheap newspaper, with their lessons of profanity and filth, become more and more the sole educators. Let the pastors of the city parishes tell us where are the boys who, eight and ten years ago, left the parochial school for the shop and the street. Has not the education of the street and the shop undermined that of the Christian school?

In Catholic agricultural communities, on the other hand, more wholesome influences abound and the dangers are fewer. The possession of the soil tends of itself to beget a provident and orderly way of life. "It is not to the intelligence alone," says John Stuart Mill, "that the situation of a peasant proprietor is full of improving influences. It is no less propitious to the moral virtues of prudence, temperance and self-control. The labourer who possesses property, whether he can read and write or not, has, as Mr. Laing remarks, 'an educated mind; he has forethought, caution and reflection guiding every action; he knows the value of restraint, and is in the constant and habitual exercise of it.'" The father of the family owns his home, and the mother is able to exercise her God-given ministry in the education of her children. She can control their associations, shield them from the contaminations of evil company, and form them to habits of piety and order. They will grow up in the midst of a stable population, with fixed notions and habits; they will be surrounded by examples of industry and frugality; they will learn to be patient, and will not lose holy shame, which, together with justice, Plato says, "the gods have sent to adorn States and

strengthen the bonds of peace." Catholic customs and traditions will prevail upon their young hearts; the fear of God will give them understanding, and as they walk in the way of righteousness they will be taught by experience that they who obey the commandments of God and the Church, need no arguments to prove that their lives are in harmony with truth. Increasing years will bring increase of love for the spot where first they saw the light. The friends of their childhood will be still around them, and their dearest wish will be to settle down in such neighbourhood that they may live as their fathers have lived. In the Catholic colonies of the West an industrious farmer may reasonably hope to see all his children living upon their own land and gathered about him to encircle his old age with honour and peace. And a family which is once so enrooted in the soil will have historic growth and survive through generations; whereas in floating populations the family has no continuity, no history; it forms and breaks like the waves of the ocean: "*labitur et labetur.*" It is needless to add that family traditions of honour and religion furnish strong motives to lead a worthy life. They are like anchors which in the turbulent sea of modern society hold the soul steadfast to the ancient faith. Where the family life is thoroughly Catholic the children will be so, even though they should not be within reach of a Catholic school. In the colonies, however, the school funds are in the hands of Catholics, by whom also the teachers are appointed.

From whatever point of view we consider this subject, its intimate connection with the future of the Church in this country, as well as of the Catholic immigrants themselves, is revealed to us.

It might be imagined that, because wages are higher, the condition of the working classes is better in America than in Europe. But in this connection the price of labour is a much less important consideration than the habits of the labourers. "The unwise use of a large salary," says Renouard, "is the cause of more misery than low wages." Though the operatives of this country receive more for their work than those of France or Belgium, it is not probable that, as a rule, they save more. The masses of them at the end of ten or twenty years are where they began—in a hired room or a wretched cottage, dependent for their bread upon their day's work. The closing of the mill, or sickness, leaves them in want, and the almshouses of Massachusetts and Rhode Island are filled with these people. The records of the New York Almshouse show that, of the 75,560 inmates received during the last twenty-five years, 46,239 were Irish. A strike in Fall River never fails to reveal the fact that thousands of the operatives there are but a step from actual want. Economy is not in the habits either of the people of Great

Britain or of this country ; and yet this is the one virtue without which the lot of an operative is hopeless, no matter how high his wages may be. In the factory towns of New England it is too often the case that the only Catholics who make money are the saloon-keepers, and in the large cities the liquor-sellers are frequently the most wealthy members of the Church. Drunkenness has done more harm to the cause of Catholicism in the United States than all other evils, and, so long as the people continue to live in the unhealthy and overcrowded tenements of the cities, all efforts to root out this plague will prove ineffectual. The whisky shop is excluded from the Catholic colonies by the people themselves, and drunkenness is unknown.

It is not a purpose of the Colonization Association, as has been stated already, to encourage emigration from Europe ; but its object is to induce the poor Catholics who are already living in the United States to leave the cities and factory towns and to settle down in communities on the cheap lands which still abound. It is plain, however, that an undertaking of this kind can at best meet with only very partial success. The vast number, in spite of all that can be said or done, will remain where they are ; and, if the movement is destined to be of real importance, its best work will be found to be the awakening of interest in this subject among the bishops and priests of the countries from which our emigrants come. The education of the people in this most vital matter lies in their hands. Nor is it enough to give them just views and correct information on the subject. There is need of organization if the work is to be effectually done. Societies should be formed to take charge of Catholic emigration ; or associations already existing, as in Germany, should add to their other works a care for the emigrant. There should be an agent in each port, to give information concerning the colonies. He might be provided with tracts and pamphlets which would furnish useful reading during the voyage, and accompany the exiles, like the voice of a friend, with pleadings not to commit themselves and their children to the dangers of the city. It would be difficult to exaggerate the good which an effective organization of this kind would accomplish. Trustworthy and detailed information concerning those parts of the country where cheap lands may still be had would be gladly furnished by the bishops within whose jurisdiction they lie, who would also assist, through the priests in charge of the various missions, those who might be directed to them in the selection of suitable homes. And in this way the commendatory letters of the early Church might be revived, to serve as passports to introduce tens of thousands of the simple faithful peasantry of Europe to a haven of peace and security.

What is to become of the 12,000 Italian peasants who have come to the United States during the last twelve months? They have all settled down in the slums and alleys of cities, or have been hired as labourers by the contractors who build railways or undertake public works; and in either case their lot is almost hopeless. There are a few so-called Italian churches here and there in the great cities, but, when we come to examine into the matter, we generally find that the worshippers are Irish; and there can be little risk in affirming that the increasing multitudes who leave Italy for the United States will not add strength to the Catholic cause here, unless something is done in Italy itself to guide and control this emigration. In Texas and Arkansas there is abundance of cheap land; and the climate of these States is not more severe than that of the Italian Peninsula, especially in the north, from which a considerable portion of the emigrants come. They belong to the agricultural classes chiefly, and are as industrious, as frugal, and as persevering as any peasant population in Europe; they are religious and moral, but they are wholly unprepared to encounter the dangers to which they are inevitably exposed in an American city, and yet they all remain there because there is no one to guide them to anything better, and their ignorance of English renders them helpless. If there were anywhere in the United States even one agricultural community of Italians the emigrants could be directed thither; but since there is none they sink into the promiscuous crowd and are lost. The year which brought these 12,000 Italians to America brought also some 19,000 Scandinavians. The Catholics have remained in the cities, the Protestants have gone West to become farmers. The latter had received some kind of knowledge, at least, of the country to which they were coming; the former had been allowed to leave home without the faintest ray of light on the real state of things in the land beyond the sea. The struggle of the Church for a firm and abiding place in the life of the American people, is one on which her fate in half the world depends. It is not a question of her supremacy in a single nation. If she is strong here she will be strong throughout the American continent; if she is weak here she will be feeble from Behring Strait to Cape Horn. No better test of her power to live and flourish here can be desired than her ability to hold the multitudes who land here with the old faith in their hearts. "*Quos dedisti mihi custodivi, et nemo ex eis periit, nisi filius perditionis.*"

Conversions here and there of a minister or a woman of fashion are well enough for a newspaper paragraph: but our first and all-important work is to keep those who come to us with the sign of faith. If the views advanced in this article have

any value, the chief obstacle to the attainment of this end is the unfortunate tendency of the Catholic immigrants to settle in the cities and towns, instead of forming agricultural communities, under conditions which cannot fail to prove favourable both to their temporal and spiritual interests. To do this, little else is required than to follow the general line of American progress and development. The stream of population here is from the dear lands to the cheap lands; from the east to the west; and if Catholic immigration could be turned into this current, and then, at proper points, distributed over the sparsely-settled portions of the newer States and Territories, there would be in such settlements as little danger of loss to the Church as in Ireland or the Tyrol. But if this work is to be done, it must be made possible by the bishops and priests of Europe, who will bring the weight of their authority and wisdom to bear upon the populations from the midst of which so many thousands each year set forth for America. The Catholic emigrants will then land upon our shores with a longing for homes of their own, and with a dread of the evils which are sure to befall them in the industrial and commercial centres; and, thus disposed, they will without difficulty find their way into the colonies.

J. W. SPALDING,
Bishop of Peoria, Ill.

ART. VI.—EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

1. *Eternal Hope. Five Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey.* By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster. London: Macmillan, 1880.
2. *Everlasting Punishment. Lectures delivered in St. James's Church, Piccadilly.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D. Dean of Norwich. London: Rivingtons, 1880.
3. *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment. In reply to Dr. Farrar's Challenge in his "Eternal Hope," 1879.* By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Second Edition. Oxford: James Parker & Co. London: Rivingtons, 1880.
4. *The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things.* By ANDREW JUKES. Seventh Edition. London: Longmans, 1878.
5. *Catholic Eschatology and Universalism. An Essay on the Doctrine of Future Retribution.* By HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. Second Edition. London: W. H. Allen, 1878.
6. *De Æternitate Pœnarum deque Igne Inferno commentarii.* Auctore CAROLO PASSAGLIA, S.J. Ratisbonæ; Manz, 1854.
7. *Institutiones Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Specialis. Tractatus de Novissimis.* Auctore BERNARDO JUNGSMANN, Ph. et Theol. D., in S. Fac. Theol. Universitæ Cath. Lovaniensis, professore ordinari. Ed. secunda. Ratisbonæ, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati, F. Pustet, 1874.
8. *Der Katholik*, 1878, zweite Hälfte. Mainz: Kirchheim.
9. *The Contemporary Review* for December, 1880. London: Strahan & Co.

THE discussion which has been going on for so many years concerning a Future State of Punishment is one of those in which the greater number of Catholics must from time to time take a part. The most widely read periodicals and the most popular preachers have been occupied of late with reasoning and with rhetoric on the awful subject of Hell Fire and its eternal duration. It is true, the debate as to the everlasting lot of the reprobate is only a branch of a very much wider controversy. It is a phase of that "disintegration" of revealed truth which goes on from age to age in a Protestant community. The Broad Church—which may be said to have lasted now for forty years—

rejected a good many traditional beliefs, and cultivated a theology which was chiefly made up of negations. But Arnold, Whately, or Hare would have thought very severely of "Essays and Reviews" and "Ecce Homo." The process of gradual breaking-up, however, went on with the inexorableness of a law. The Broad Church School is now fossilizing; its representatives are men who are seen through by all the foremost thinkers of the day. Many of them, such as Dean Stanley and Canon Farrar, have still an enormous literary power and influence; but this does not in any way make the fact less true, that the men of thought and culture are leaving them behind. Broad Churchism has broken down into Unitarianism, Humanitarianism, and Universalism. Where men were wont to protest against priesthood, purgatory, and prayers to the saints, we have now the rejection of prayer to our Lord, of prayer of every kind, of all spiritual effects, and of the eternity and the very existence of Hell.

At the same time the scientific Agnostics have been doing what they could to include the doctrine of Eternal Punishment in the condemnation and the confusion which they have been invoking upon all Christian doctrine in general. In language which for power and effectiveness cannot be surpassed in our day, they have been bringing out into the air of the nineteenth century the arguments or sophisms—many of them undoubtedly very strong or very specious—which have appeared in varying shapes, in all divinity treatises on the nature of God and the *novissima* of man, from the time of St. Augustine downwards.

Of the books at the head of this article, Canon Farrar's "Eternal Hope" is perhaps the most important from a practical point of view. It has had, and continues to have, a very strong influence. It is the book of a man who has sufficient learning to convince all but those who take the trouble to analyze him or verify him, and sufficient logical power to give a backbone to the rhetorical forms in which his great strength lies. The rhetoric of sermons such as his, is troublesome to an inquirer and a critic. It is frequently most difficult, both with Canon Farrar, and with Dean Goulburn on the other side, to make sure of what they hold. They exclaim, they use irony, they ask questions, they insinuate, they "deprecate." No Protestant sermon-maker dares to lay down dogmatic truth; he generally asks, "Might it not be" so and so; "May we not well believe" something else; and when he wishes to express his disapproval of some slight heresy—as, for instance, Arianism or Sabellianism—he ventures to "deprecate;" a word which ought in all fairness to be left entirely for the use of the Anglican Bishops, who are obliged from time to time to point out the encroachments of

Dissenters and the profligacy of Ritualists, and who have no other way to do it except to "deprecate." In his Six Lectures, delivered during the course of last summer in St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Dean Goulburn defends the ordinary "orthodox" doctrine as to Hell, and propounds a purgatory of his own devising—a purgatory for those who die "in faith," where there is no pain, but only progress, where the "spirit is gradually purified, trained, disciplined, illuminated, and so made far meeter than it was" for Heaven.* Mr. Jukes's "Restitution of All Things" is one of the most elaborate attempts yet published to establish Universalism from the Scriptures. To Mr. H. N. Oxenham's widely known "Eschatology" we shall have to make frequent reference in the course of this article. The work is as ably reasoned as it is eloquently written, and shows a very complete acquaintance with the literature of the subject. Dr. Pusey's "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment," is most valuable. It is a reply to the challenge made by Canon Farrar in his "Eternal Hope," in which the latter calls on Dr. Pusey by name, and appeals to him to repudiate with all possible haste those "popular" opinions about Hell, which are not of Faith. The book contains a criticism on Canon Farrar's scriptural citations, an exhaustive examination into the belief of the Jews of our Lord's day concerning Hell (in which Canon Farrar comes off very poorly indeed), and an Appendix of quotations from the words of the martyrs, the early Christians, and the Fathers, which will prove very acceptable in all future stages of this controversy. The four articles of the eminent Münster Professor, Dr. Hense, in the *Katholik* (1878), are an exhaustive statement and proof of the reality of the "Fire of Hell." Dr. Hense's handling of Patristic texts on this subject is especially good, and Dr. Pusey might have consulted him profitably in one or two instances; and his tentative explanation of what the nature of the "Fire" may be, has the interest of novelty, whilst it is certainly not to be rejected at first sight.

One of the disadvantages of the "orthodox" Anglican writers on this tremendous subject is, that they really do not know what to defend and what to give up. There seems to be really no definite point, except the "eternity," which they are at all certain they ought to cling to. "Eternity" happens to be an idea which is incapable of analysis; or else, if there were a possibility of being puzzled as to what the exact meaning of it was, the Anglican writers would be sure to be so puzzled. They are puzzled as to what Hell is, where it is, what the Fire is, how many are lost, and whether there are degrees of punishment; in regard to eternity

* Preface, p. vi.

they must either admit or deny it altogether. No Catholic will assert that all which is contained in popular books on Eternal Punishment is of the same degree of authority. There are dogmas of defined faith, there are matters of faith proposed by the ordinary magisterium of the Church, there are certainties which are not of faith, and there are pious opinions. In addition to these, there are doubtless opinions which are not pious. As it is the purpose of this article to defend God's holy revelation in one or two of the chief points connected with the doom of the lost, and to try to answer some of the objections now commonly put forward, it will be well to begin by a brief statement of what we are bound to hold as Catholics on this subject.

1. It is an article of faith that the souls of those who die in mortal sin go down to "Hell" immediately after death, and are punished with the punishments of Hell. If any one wants to know where this is defined, he may find it in the Decree of Union of the Council of Florence. This dogma settles that there is a (place of) punishment for the wicked.

2. It is of faith, moreover, that one part of the punishment of Hell is the loss of the beatific vision of God (*pœna damni*).

3. It is equally of faith that there is in Hell a pain of sense (*pœna sensus*). This is clearly expressed in numerous passages of Holy Scripture, and is taught by the Church's ordinary magisterium. The pain, or rather, the punishment, of sense, is not used by Catholic divines in the acceptation of merely physical suffering; it is rather employed in contradistinction to the "loss," and means everything else which the condemned creature experiences in the abode of woe, whether mentally or corporeally, physically or spiritually.

4. It is a certain and "Catholic" truth that the "Fire" of Hell is not a metaphorical fire, but true, real, and material fire. F. Perrone implies that though this is certain, it is not "of faith."* Dr. Jungmann, however, points out that the "sensus communis," or common consent, of the Church and of the faithful undoubtedly proclaims it.† Dr. Hense concludes his fourth article on the subject thus:—

It is clear that a truth so unmistakably expressed in every age, both in the theoretical teaching and in the practice of the Church, must of necessity find its way into the living belief of the whole body of the faithful and become fast rooted therein. As a matter of fact, the Catholic flock is penetrated to the quick with this conviction—they would not tolerate a contradictory teaching, but would abhor it as an error against revealed truth.‡

* "Prælect. Theol. de Deo Creatore," p. 3, cap. 6, art. 3.

† "De Novissimis Hominis," ed. 1874, p. 32.

‡ *Der Katholik* 1878, zweite Hälfte, p. 601.

When, however, these theologians and the pastors of the Church in their ordinary instructions teach a real fire, they do not mean that it is in every way like our earthly, natural fire. Indeed, fire, even on earth, is of so many kinds and degrees, that any picture of burning coals or heated metal, though useful as an analogical illustration, is of no use whatever to a theologian or a philosopher. Heat, according to the latest physical theories on the subject, is a mode of motion. Fire, therefore, is simply a corporal substance under the influence of that kind of "motion" or energy which is called heat. If the energy called heat be identical in ordinary fire, in electricity, and in light, then it is the most powerful and universal of existing physical agencies. Now we may naturally expect that if the lost are punished corporeally, the instrument of their punishment will be that "energy" which plays the chief part in the fashioning and transforming of the universe. "He will arm the creature for the revenge of His enemies."* Catholic tradition, however, does not teach anything about the nature of the Fire of Hell, except that it is not metaphorical, is not mental, or imaginary, or spiritual; but that it is material and external, acts immediately on the persons of the lost after the consuming or "disrupting" fashion of ordinary fire, and is accompanied by pain on the part of those who are subjected to it. To use the often quoted words of St. Augustine:—"Qui ignis cujusmodi est, hominum scire arbitror neminem, nisi forte cui Spiritus divinus ostendit."†

5. The society of the demons and of the other lost souls is also, according to Catholic tradition, a part of the suffering of Hell; and it seems probable that each of the damned is especially punished in regard to those faculties and senses wherein he particularly sinned. This, perhaps, is the meaning of St. Paul when he says that, in the last day, every one shall receive *τὰ τοῦ σώματος*, the "things of the body."‡ The "gnawing worm" is a real torment, but is probably a metaphorical expression for the stings of memory and remorse.

6. That the torments of Hell are not the same or equal in all the lost, but that they are proportioned to the guilt of each individual soul, is a matter of certain Catholic tradition. In the decree of Union already cited, the Council of Florence, after stating that the wicked descend into Hell after death, adds, "but will be punished with unequal pains."§ In the classical words of

* Wisdom, v. 18.

† "De Civitate Dei," lib. xx. cap. 16.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 10.

§ "Pœnis disparibus." It should be observed, however, that the full text of the Council in this passage seems to show that the word "disparibus" refers rather to the unequal punishment of actual and original sin, than to the varying sentences of those who die in the guilt of actual. But the point is otherwise beyond doubt.

St. Augustine:—"We cannot doubt that the sufferings of those who shall be excluded from God's kingdom are of diverse degrees, some being more severe than others; so that in eternity the varying degrees of guilt are visited by varying degrees of torment. For it was not in vain that our Lord said, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom than for you in the day of judgment."* Even the essential pain of eternal loss—the loss of that God whom the soul must have or be for ever a wreck—will vary in its intensity in proportion as the will has with greater or less obstinacy turned away from its last end.

7. As to the "locality" of Hell, nothing is defined, and very little is to be found in the ordinary authorities. It would certainly be "rash" to deny that Hell is a definite place. But whether it is or is not in the centre of the earth, we have no means of deciding.†

8. The question whether there can ever be any diminution or relaxation of the pains of eternal damnation is one which theologians are very brief in treating. It does not seem to be of any great importance. God is just; and the just proportion of suffering may be fixed as easily by a sentence which will run for ever unchanged, as by one which will provide for mitigation after a period. St. Thomas, in his Commentary on Peter Lombard,‡ rejects the idea that Hell will ever be mitigated, and speaks of such an opinion as presumptuous, irrational, and contrary to the teaching of the Fathers. On the other hand, St. Augustine, in a well-known passage of the *Enchiridion*,§ allows it to be held. St. Chrysostom, moreover,|| seems in favour of it. Petavius¶ thinks that it is an idea which must not be rashly rejected, though he admits that it was against the feelings of the Catholics of his own day. There is a singular passage of Prudentius, quoted by Father Hürter in his recently published "*Dogmatic Theology*," which deserves commemoration here. It occurs in the "*Cathemerinon*" or "*daily hymn*," many parts of which were certainly used in divine worship in various churches; and the fifth part, from which the following extract is taken, bears in some editions an annotation or rubric, to the effect that it is to be sung at the lighting of the Paschal Candle.

Sunt et spiritibus sæpe nocentibus
Pœnarum celebres sub Styge feræ

* "Cont. Donatistas," lib. iv. cap. 19.

† An Englishman, Jeremy Swinden, who died about 1720, published a book "*On the Fire of Hell and of the Place of Hell*." He attempted to prove that Hell was in the Sun. He was elaborately answered by the Dominican Father Patuzzi, in the first half of last century.

‡ In iv. dist. 45, quæst. 2.

§ N. 110, 112.

|| Hom. 2, in *Epist. ad Philip.*, n. 3, 4. ¶ Lib. iii., *De Angelis*, cap. 7.

Illa nocte sacer quâ rediit Deus
 Stagnis ad superos ex Acheronticis
 Marcent suppliciis Tartara mitibus,
 Exsultatque sui carceris otio
 Umbrarum populus liber ab ignibus,
 Nec fervent solito flumina sulphure.*

This passage, which has often doubtless been chanted in many a church, distinctly says that the condemned spirits in Hell receive some alleviation or mitigation of their sufferings on the day which annually commemorates our Lord's Resurrection. The Delphin editor of Prudentius, the Jesuit Chamillard, roundly says that the poet is mistaken.

9. If we inquire into the comparative number of the lost, we are again landed in mere speculation. That a large majority of the human race so far have been excluded from the Beatific Vision on account of sin, either original or actual, seems not to be doubted. That a majority, or even a large proportion of the race have been cast into the Hell of the damned, or are suffering in more than a negative way, may well be disputed. As Dr. Pusey points out, one-third of mankind die before coming to the use of reason. Add to these the heathen in the "shadow of death," and the millions in Christian lands who are invincibly ignorant of all but the very first ideas of faith and morality, and we have a very large number indeed whose punishment—or whose banishment rather—will surely be very light. For if there is one thing that is certain it is this—that no one will ever be punished with the positive punishments of the life to come who has not, with full knowledge and complete consciousness and full consent, turned his back upon Almighty God.

It will be evident from this summary statement that what we are chiefly concerned to defend is the "eternal duration" of the doom of the lost. There are several misconceptions to clear up as to other points; but the stress of the battle rages round Hell's Eternity.

A good many plain persons will be astonished to hear from Canon Farrar that there is not a single passage of Holy Scripture in which an endless duration is assigned to the punishment of the wicked after death! Biblical scholars, of course, are well aware of the controversy, if controversy it can be called. But it was thought, at least by Catholic theologians, that such a philological and critical essay as that of Passaglia† had done something to settle the question. Dr. Farrar does not seem to

* Prudentius, "Cathemerinon," v. 125.

† "De æternitate pœnarum, deque Igne inferno commentarii." Ratisbonæ, Manz, 1854.

have read Passaglia. He has read and copied Mr. Jukes; and he is strong on the distinction between Γέννα and Ἀϊδης, and between Judgment (κρίσις) and Damnation—for he has written on Hell in Smith's "Dictionary." He has devoted two excursus in his book on "Eternal Hope" to a (very meagre) examination of the philological questions arising from the use of these words, and of αἰώνιος.

One result of this attempt is that it has called forth a crushing answer from Dr. Pusey. We propose to sum up the discussion, referring the reader for full particulars to the works themselves of Passaglia and of Dr. Pusey.

Eternal duration is outside of experience, and, therefore, outside of human thought and language. In order, therefore, to express it, there was no alternative but to employ words and phrases which originally meant only a "long time." The Hebrew word עולם, αἰών (*æternum*), means that which lasts for ever. It also came to mean the "world," as being that which "lasted," in distinction to the varying phenomena which succeeded each other on its surface. No one maintains that the word in the Old Testament or in the New always means literally endless duration. But the thought of endless duration had to be expressed, and the word αἰών was used, either by itself or in a phrase. In order to obtain a phrase which should in some way give the idea of really endless duration, it was obvious to employ that species of Hebrew reduplication of which there are so many examples; and the strong phrase, "unto ages of ages," or "eternity of eternities," is common in both Testaments. Now we will confine ourselves to one point only, and we will quote Father Passaglia:—

The phrase *eis τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* (in *sæcula sæculorum*) never occurs in the Septuagint. In the New Testament it is employed *only* in connection with the following subjects: 1. The happiness of the elect; 2. The glory which they give to God and which He is to give to them; 3. The immortality of our Lord after His resurrection; 4. The endless reign of Christ; 5. The life of God. Not counting, then, the passages in dispute, we find that in every single instance in which it is used, this phrase expresses, literally, perpetuity of duration. Therefore they who construe it when applied to the punishment of the wicked as signifying a duration that will end, are the slaves of a hypothesis, and resist an ascertained conclusion.*

Dr. Pusey makes a wider induction. He takes, not the strong reduplicative expression, but the simple word αἰώνιος.

In the New Testament it occurs seventy-one times; of eternal life, forty-four times; of Almighty God, His Spirit and His Glory, three

* Passaglia, *op. cit.* p. 14.

times; of the Kingdom of Christ, His Redemption, the Blood of His Covenant, His Gospel, salvation, our habitation in Heaven; of the glory laid up for us, thrice; our inheritance, consolation, of a share of eternal life; of eternal fire, thrice; of punishment, judgment, destruction, four times. Of the future, then, it is nowhere used in the New Testament, except of eternal life or punishment.*

The induction made in these two passages is simply decisive. No argument from etymology or primitive meaning, or Old Testament usage, can outweigh the plain fact that wherever the word is used in the New Testament it means literal perpetuity.

There are particular passages, too, which no ingenuity can explain away. Such is Mark ix. 42-50—the “very awful” text as Mr. Jukes calls it, which speaks of the punishment of scandal, and repeats twice the words, “Where their worm dieth not and their fire is not extinguished.” The explanation by which Mr. Jukes attempts to nullify the force of these words of our Lord is too feeble to deserve attention. Such are the passages of the Apocalypse† in which there is twice the vision of the “smoke of their torments” going up “for ever and ever”; passages on which a strong light is thrown by the words of Isaias,‡ from which their terminology is evidently taken. As Passaglia well observes, either St. John and Isaias used terms expressive of eternal duration, or else there is no such term to be found. The impugnors of the eternity of retribution for sin hardly attempt to grapple with the weighty considerations here alluded to.

Thirdly, to omit all reference to other texts, there are the passages in which there is an expressed parallelism between the duration of the life to come and of the punishment of the wicked. Canon Farrar rejects with contempt the argument founded on these texts. “It is,” he says, “of all arguments on the question the most absolutely and hopelessly futile.” He warns us that it “will not weigh the 1000th part of a scruple with those who (as they think) have again and again furnished the proof which they regard as conclusive.”§ This might probably be asserted without fear of contradiction of a good many other arguments, but no one can for a moment bring his mind to bear on the real logical nature of the proof here indicated without admitting that it is beyond all doubt most powerful and cogent. St. Augustine long ago expressed it:

What a thing it is to account Eternal Punishment to be a fire of long duration (merely), and Eternal Life to be without end, since Christ comprised both in that very same place, in one and the same sentence, saying, “These shall go into eternal punishment, but the just into life

* “What is of Faith,” p. 38.
† xxxiv. 9-11.

† xiv. 11, xix. 3, xx. 16.
§ *Contemporary Review*, June, 1878.

everlasting." If both are eternal, either both must be understood to be lasting, with an end, or both perpetual without end. For like is related to like; on the one side eternal punishment, on the other eternal life. But to say in one and the same sentence, life eternal shall be without end, punishment eternal shall have an end, were too absurd; whence, since the eternal life of the saints shall be without end, punishment eternal, too, shall doubtless have no end to those whose it shall be.*

As Passaglia admirably observes, those who deny that in the passage referred to† there is any proof of the eternity of punishment, must maintain that in one short passage, a passage of momentous import as containing the last sentence of the Supreme Judge, one and the same word is used in two senses, making the sentence itself simply equivocal.‡ Dr. Pusey says:—

The argument is not merely from language. It has a moral and religious aspect. Any ordinary writer who drew a contrast between two things, would, if he wished to be understood, use the self-same word in the self-same sense. He would avoid ambiguity. If he did not, we should count him ignorant of languages, or, if it were intentional, dishonest.§

Doubtless the word "Hell" is often so used as to mean merely "beyond the grave." But a child may see that when our Lord uses the word Γέννα, He means more than death, or Jewish doom. The word generally used in the Old Testament to express the nether-world is Αἶδης. It is our Lord alone who uses Gehenna. There is no need to tell us that it originally meant the valley of Hinnom; that it then, for reasons well-known, became a word which (1) implied the judgment of a Jewish court—the casting forth of an unburied corpse amid the fires and worms of the polluted valley—and (2) a punishment—which to the Jews (says Canon Farrar) as a body, never meant an endless punishment—beyond the grave. There never was a more gratuitous assertion. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the Jews of our Lord's day both knew of, and believed in, Eternal Punishment. As Mr. Oxenham well points out, one has to be no more deeply read than is consistent with knowing Josephus to be able to assert this with confidence.|| And Dr. Pusey says:—

Belief in the eternity of future punishment is contained in the 4th Book of Maccabees, in the so-called Psalms of Solomon; the second death is mentioned in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; Josephus attests the belief of the Pharisees and the Essenes in the eternity of punishment.¶

* "De Civitate Dei," xxi. 23.

‡ Op. cit. p. 21.

|| "Eschatology," p. 154.

† S. Matthew, xxv. 46.

§ "What is of Faith," p. 44.

¶ "What is of Faith," p. 48.

He gives in full the passages not only from the sources mentioned, but also from the Talmud, and after an exhaustive inquiry, extending over sixty pages, he concludes that there is "absolutely no ground to think that the Jews in our Lord's day understood by Gehenna anything else than what lies upon the surface of the word, that it was the place of punishment of those who to the end would not have God as their god."* And thus he destroys what Canon Farrar holds out as his "palmary" argument.

It is not, however, the Scriptural difficulties in connection with Eternal Punishment which are most insisted upon by the rationalizing writers of the day, but rather those ethical considerations which seem to forbid right reason to admit its possibility. Scripture goes a very little way, at the present day, with the majority even of professed Christians, whether Anglicans or Nonconformists, because they have no scruple in interpreting Scripture in accordance with their own views. That every man should be his own interpreter is almost the same as that every man should be his own Bible. The Broad or Rationalistic Protestant, therefore, finds little difficulty in joining his forces to the Agnostics, and attacking the dogma of Hell from the point of view of right reason. It becomes absolutely necessary that Catholics should be able to see through the sophisms or the half-truths which are so common in regard to one of the most essential points of God's revelation. Before replying to objections it will be useful to explain one or two considerations which cut away the ground from a great number of objections. It hardly seems too much to say that "Hell" can positively be proved by human reason, from data of reason and of revelation combined. This, at least, is true, that we can find in the study of observed spiritual and moral phenomena, and in the comparison of indisputable laws of God's creation, an indication, such as prompts the watcher of the skies to expect the appearance of a new planet, that an eternal doom of evil must be awaiting sin just beyond the grave.

It is assumed here that the spiritual part of man—that is to say, that principle by which he is man, and can perform those purely human operations of universalizing, of reasoning by putting together abstractions, and of longing for the ideal—that is, in one word, his soul—will never cease to exist. It is admitted on all sides that, ordinarily speaking, nothing ever does cease to exist; that for an existent thing to cease to be would require an act equal to an act of creation; that things are dissolved or go to pieces, but that their simple parts remain; and

* P. 102.

since, if there is such a thing as a "thinking faculty," that faculty can be demonstratively proved to be without any "parts" whatever, to name such a faculty is to prove that it exists substantially unchanged for ever. We assume also the great fact of death, which also need hardly be proved. At death all that is composite in human nature is dissolved and freshly combined. But the spiritual or immaterial part remains unchanged in itself, changed only in its environment. To say that the spirit, thus deprived of its ministering brain and nerves, has no longer any conscious life but lies for ever torpid and unmoved, is to imagine a universe of sleeping spirits stored away in unknown recesses of creation like mummies in the deserted temples of ancient Egypt. The spirit, therefore, will live and move after death as before death. So long as it is without that material sphere which it is its nature to inform and penetrate, it will act in a non-natural manner, varying according to the sphere in which it finds itself; but when, as the Christian dogma holds, the flesh shall rise again, then it will be at liberty to exist, to move and to live as its nature is. This much we can almost read for ourselves.

But the spirit has, or is, Knowledge and Desire. Not only has it Knowledge and Desire, but it can never satisfy itself with knowing and desiring, as long as its objects have any limit whatever. This is its nature. It is no homiletic "point" to say that the spirit would, in the long run, grow weary of everything. This rigidly follows from two well-known experiences—first, that what is known does not thrill the attention a second time as it did the first time; and, secondly, that reflection can always add the thought of something more than what is seen, and always trace, beyond the bounds of what is actual, a horizon in the distance still unreached. These experiences might let every man understand the awful nature of the fiery and immortal spirit he carries within his breast.

It is obvious to object that millions of men do pass very happy lives, and long lives too, without troubling themselves about more than sensual and æsthetic pleasures. This is true; and although not true to the extent that is sometimes pretended, yet it is true enough to be admitted without scruple. But it stands to reason that of the soul's interminable existence only a very short period will be passed in a state in which it is liable to be fettered, blindfolded, and distracted by its senses. A soul once admitted, with its unlimitable faculties, nothing can be more certain than that it will one day, and for a long day, find itself in an atmosphere when it must either be filled with its own proper knowing and desire, or experience a void and a craving which none of its troublesome senses could ever feel. The argument may not be pushed

too far. The possibility of forming some conception of the Infinite, and the dissatisfaction of the Desire with all finite desirable things, do not peremptorily prove that man is by nature formed to know and possess the Infinite, seen face to face. But they do prove that earthly life, even as far as nature goes, is meant to end very soon, and that there must come some day a larger world, a clearer and a keener atmosphere, a state of awful silence, solitude, and intense life, when the spirit, instead of attaining absolute Truth and Beauty through the chinks and fissures of her mortal clay, will be in a state in which the flood can pour itself upon her faculty, and she must rejoice in it, or find the misery of having no claim to its sovereign joys. Our nature is the subject of God's grace, as a fact, and our destiny is higher even than this. But the lot here indicated does actually realize itself in the case of those millions who die unbaptized and before the use of reason; and perhaps in millions more.

If the soul is to live for ever, and to live in an atmosphere of awful light or awful darkness, there can be little doubt, even to our uninstructed natural reason, that its state—which is its fate—will be fixed, and no longer capable of substantial alteration. It is not absolutely impossible that a clearly-seeing spirit should change from hating its last end to adhering to it. It is most difficult to understand how such a change can be—or the opposite change, either. Change of desire or adhesion, with us, happens when a new aspect of a desirable thing comes uppermost, or when some known consideration is lost sight of. An unimpeded spirit can see so widely around that this thoroughness of penetration, joined to its freedom from the distractions of the senses, makes it almost, though not quite, impossible for new motives of action, or new sides of truth, or new aspects of desirability, to present themselves. How the angels could sin—how even our first parents could sin, endowed as they were, and serenely self-possessed as they were—must always be a mystery. The sin, once committed, must in both cases have been very deep. But the proper condition of unimpeded view is stability. The Last End, or God, is so potent an attraction to the faculties of a nature created to attain it, that such a nature needs only clearness of view to be won, and almost necessarily won. Free choice, it would seem, should be overpowered and unable to stir in the presence of the All-good; for freedom depends upon limitation of vision. We can choose because we can alter, by our way of looking at them, the aspects of things—not because the things attract us. This is our prerogative as reasonable beings gifted with reason. But, speaking broadly, it is only natural in this present life of gross materialism and of sensual fetters. Yet it is the root of merit, because it is the condition of responsibility.

Thus, natural reason points to two states of human existence : the state of unhindered spirituality and of stability, without elective freedom and without responsibility ; and the state of immersion in matter, of fettered action, but of power to choose, of responsibility and of merit. The state of stability will naturally depend on the end or result of the preceding state of elective freedom. The soul, fettered as she is, does know her Last End, and can adhere to Him with her choice. When the hour of bodily dissolution strikes, and the mortal clay finally breaks to pieces like the pitchers which covered the lamps of Gideon's band, then the light shines out : but the light is as it has been lighted. The long or the short course of free-will, of choice, of aversion, of struggle, of acquiescence, has resulted in an attitude of the soul—as when some gladiator dies in the arena, his body lying where it fell, his limbs arrested as they were bent, his face marked with the pain or the triumph of the last moment. If the soul be separated in an hour when her clinging is to the Good of all good, so far as she has seen and known It in the days of her flesh, then that attitude of rectitude finds its fulfilment and perfection in the fuller vision of the disembodied state. If death come upon her when her desire is averted, and her deliberate preference is turned to the base things which have come in her way on her journey, then that aversion from Good becomes her fixed state. An objector might say, Would she not make her choice afresh in the clearer light of the new atmosphere? We are speaking only of what human reasoning can guide us to ; and the answer is, No. Her vision, like her clinging, is *set*. A distorted vision sees things as crookedly from the highest peak as it does on the ground. The more she looks, the more she is filled with aversion. She cannot change or repent now. Repentance comes of new views. God's goodness gains some new light, as the sun brings out the forms of distant hills ; iniquity loses some charm which earthly mist had wrapped about her ; retribution stands forward out of the gloom and puts on new terrors. All these things come to us with the rolling tides and shifting lights of earthly existence. But in the land of spirits there is no shadow, nothing to bar the sight, no perspective, no distance, no succession save acts of will. Therefore the soul's distortion settles into a law of her being, and her aversion hardens into eternal hate. And then the void, the craving, the acknowledged failure, the total wreck of being's purpose—what wonder if there is a Hell? Hell is a law. Just as it is a law that pent-up water, when its weight and force have reached a certain point, breaks its barriers and sweeps down upon the region, so it is a law that sin, or unrighteousness, or willful aversion from Good, if it reach the boundary, Death, unreformed, will go on for ever

so, and will bring eternal separation from Good ; and separation, in a spiritual nature, means misery.

This is a "rationalistic" view of Hell. Given a spirit with a fleshly nature ; given a God, who is its Last End ; given dissolution, and immortality ; then there are the elements of a Hell. It is a very imperfect account, doubtless, of that dread article of God's revelation of which we treat. But the reason why this process of natural inference has been laid before the reader is, because it seems to prove the absolute reasonableness and probability (if not the necessity) of a Hell, and at the same time to show that, substantially, the objections which are urged against the revealed dogma are really urged against some of the most primary and deeply rooted conclusions of the human reason. Those who fight against an eternal Hell, are fighting against free-will, immortality, and God, who fashioned the heart of man.

The great truth that Hell, in its substance and essence, is a law of the universe, sweeps away at once an enormous amount of declamation. Many men are scandalized when the Holy Scriptures ascribe "anger" and "vengeance" to Almighty God. They ought to know that, in strict theology, anger and passion are as impossible in the Infinite as growth or succession. God's "anger" means no change in Himself ; His "vengeance" denotes nothing at variance with the unalterable calm of His eternal being. These words mean outward effects only, not states of being. It is true that if the preacher and the catechist had to speak of the Infinite in no other terms than those of pure science, they would not only fail to reach the multitude, but what they said would practically fall short of truth. You cannot reform the "unsanitariness" of a town by merely naming the technicalities of chemistry and physiology. So, to preach God's kingdom and His name, we use words that are not "adequately" true, yet not false ; they are what is called analogical. Goodness, beauty, and truth are attributes of God ; but we only know them in created manifestations. When we ascribe them to God we know that in Him they are very different ; yet not precisely different, but magnified, intensified, luminous and pure. All that they are or mean in creation they are, or mean, in the Creator ; yet without attendant limitations, and also with a glorious enhancement, as when some humble element, lustreless and base, suddenly takes that crystal form which gives it the gleaming hardness of the diamond—an enhancement which pure and solitary hearts see dimly in their visions, but which no heart ever grasps or holds. The human analysis, then, of God's most simple nature into attributes is only necessary because we have no other way of taking hold of Him with our reason. We need not be afraid that any attribute of

His will contradict the testimony of our own nature as to what is right or good or true or merciful. We have to be wary, sometimes, as to what we really take to be the witness of conscience and of reason; for local and temporary causes may breed prejudice and error which may look as important and as genuine as the ultimate dictates of reason herself. But God's image in man cannot contradict God Himself. Thus if God is "good" and "just" in a way which is His own, yet which is also our way as far as our way goes, He is also "angry" and an "avenger" only in the way in which these characters may not misbecome His highest nature. There cannot be "anger" in the Lord when He punishes, more than there is in the steel of the sword which pierces men, or the wind of the storm, or the "merciless" waves which drown the innocent and the guilty alike. God wills, judges, and decrees; He cannot be "angry" in a literal sense. But the effect is as if He were. Much less can any thought of gratified revenge or spite be attributed to the Eternal. God crushes evil as surely as the avalanche grinds the rocks into dust. He also does whatever He does with the highest exercise of personal intellection and will. And that is all.

Natural reason, then, points to two things, first, that human creatures who turn from their Last End must anticipate an endless retribution, or state of aversion combined with misery; and secondly, that it is not their Maker, angry with human anger, who will bind fetters on them, and order scourges, but rather the force of the inexorable laws of the things which He has made. But it is also true, and cannot for one moment be denied, that the Christian revelation has made the conception of Hell both more certain and much more definite. We shall include the greater part of what can here be said in vindication of God's holy revelation of Everlasting Punishment by explaining (1) What kind of sinfulness it is that merits Hell; (2) What is understood by the "pains" of Hell, and especially the "pain of sense;" and (3) The reasonableness of their eternal duration.

Almost all the Protestant writers on the subject of Future Punishment admit that the common Protestant dogma, or view, which divides the world between Heaven and Hell immediately after death, is utterly unreasonable and unwarranted by Scripture. Some intermediate state there must be. Canon Farrar maintains a kind of intermediate state. Dean Goulburn thinks that those who die in faith and penitence, but imperfect, are taken—not to "Purgatory"—he cannot away with the word, but—to "Paradise" as distinct from Heaven.

I entirely share the feeling which is now so commonly avowed, that Protestants have not given that prominence to the doctrine of the intermediate, as distinct from the ultimate, state, which Scripture so

clearly asserts, and the assertion of which is quite necessary to exhibit in full symmetry and significance the orthodox Catholic doctrine of the Last Things. At the same time I entirely fail to see how, compatibly with the ideas called up in the mind by the word "Paradise," *purgatorial suffering* can be supposed to be an ingredient in the illumination and sanctification which are characteristic of the intermediate state of the righteous.*

This slipshod passage is very characteristic of Dean Goulburn. It shows what things are coming to, when the doctrine of the "intermediate state," so long and so roundly rejected as a Romish corruption, is preached in Cathedral pulpits. It is of little use to reject the word Purgatory. Dean Goulburn's "Paradise," by his own showing, is a place of "purification, training and discipline." Purgatory is only that. But who knows how much that implies?

We can heartily agree, then, with Canon Farrar in one thing. We reject much more summarily than he does the Protestant view of Hell—that all sin, even the least, is punished with eternal death. Hell—the true and awful Hell—is for grievous or mortal sin. With Catholics there is no hesitation as to what is meant by mortal sin. It is that complete rejection of God which involves the extinction of sanctifying grace, which is the soul's life. It may not be always easy to tell whether this or that act is really a mortal sin. Acts differ, not only objectively, but also subjectively. It would be comparatively easy to distinguish "mortal" sins if we had only to consider them objectively, apart from the person who commits them. The difficulty is to know whether the personal circumstances of knowledge, advertence and consent, are such as to impart to the act of aversion from God sufficient completeness to plunge the soul into the darkness of spiritual death. Happily, we are not called upon to do so. Even the judge in the sacred tribunal of the Sacrament need only take reasonable pains to form his judgment. But this much is certain—that only mortal sin, true and complete, will deserve Hell. When one considers how much sin is due to ignorance not fully culpable, to sudden gusts of passion which diminish the power of reason, to actual inadvertence of the grievousness of a given act, and to the dimly appreciated connection of act with act—and when one takes into account those turnings of the heart to God, which come at some period or other to most of those, sinners as they may be, who have known God in their youth, we see at once that it is unnecessary to go to extreme lengths in condemning the multitudes to Hell. It must be ever borne in mind, then, that everlasting punishment is for what

* "Everlasting Punishment," Preface, p. vii.

St. Thomas calls "*certa malitia*," determined malice. The God of all justice cannot punish with eternal exclusion anything else. He must, and will, make every allowance for antecedent passion, for blindness, for ignorance, for inadvertence. When a human creature, with its eyes open, has turned away from its known Last End, and when death comes and finds that habit or "set" of the heart existing, then, and then only, is the awful ministry of never-ending retribution called in.*

The fuel of Hell, then, is mortal sin. Now mortal sin is the creature's *necessary* ruin and wreck. By mortal sin, the creature drives headlong against a fixed law of this universe. To this we have already referred. Given light and obstinacy—both of which we cannot doubt there will be beyond the veil—and a fixed state of aversion, and of consequent misery, is the result. But the Last End, which is the subject-matter of this awful law, is not mere law, it is personal; it is the Creator, the Maker and fashioner of souls. This, also, is a necessary law. The "end" of a rational creature must be the Infinite. But further: under this present dispensation, there is a revelation; and this revelation gives us the knowledge that our last end, by mere bounty of our Maker, is God; God seen—not in any common or natural way—but face to face, even as He sees us. To elevate our human soul to the capability of thus looking on the Infinite, a certain miraculous endowment will be needful, called the "light of glory"—which is our heavenly transformation. To prepare for and secure this transformation in the heavens, is given as the transformation of "sanctifying grace" on the earth. "The Grace of God is life everlasting."† Thus the human soul, by the grace of God, is elevated to a very high destiny, and placed on paths far above those which its mere nature would be able to find. But a fall from a pinnacle is a very deadly fall; the rejection of grace is of greater guilt in proportion to the gift which is rejected; aversion from God as the supernatural end is a sin against light by excellence and goodness supreme. The mortal sins of duly instructed Christians, then, are nothing less than the deliberate rejection of the very majesty of the Infinite. Let it be clearly understood that this is the kind of crime for which Holy Scripture and Church teaching announce that "Hell is prepared from yesterday."‡

* Mr. Oxenham most appropriately cites this very striking passage from Father Faber: "As to those who may be lost, I confidently believe that our Heavenly Father threw His arms around each created spirit, and looked it full in the face with bright eyes of love in the darkness of its mortal life, and that of its own deliberate will it would not have Him." ("Creator and Creature," p. 368); "Eschatology," p. 176.

† Rom. vi. 23.

‡ Isaiah xxx. 33.

The soul, therefore, which is judged guilty of deadly sin unrepented, will experience the Sufferings of Hell. The one point in which all who pretend to be Christians agree is that for the sinner there is suffering beyond the grave. They may reject "sensible" suffering, they may limit the duration of suffering, they may make the most of words like purification, remorse, mental agony and spiritual fear; but they unite in holding that the sinner shall not escape the hands of the living God.*

Let us note the point which is here conceded. Aversion from God means suffering. Just as the bursting of the river's barriers means destruction of life and property, so the finding oneself on the other side of death in this state of aversion means that exclusion from good things, that encountering of contraries, that jarring, confusion, disruption and displacement which is fitly called "wreck." But "wreck" in a living being means suffering. The tree is smitten with the axe, and is destroyed; the living creature is smitten and passes through pain and agony before death comes. We are safe in concluding that the higher the nature the greater is the possibility of pain. In conceding, therefore, the fact of mental or spiritual suffering, there is conceded the fact of a suffering of which no illustration from physical pain can give any adequate idea. The thing can be tested even in mortal life. It is a simple fact that the most atrocious of bodily tortures will sometimes be forgotten in the shock of hearing some glad or disastrous news, or in the pre-occupation of some mental or spiritual view. There is sufficient evidence, even to a mere scientific experimentalist, that in several of the recorded cases of martyrdom, there were periods when, amid indescribable physical horrors, no physical pain was felt. In lesser matters the same thing happens daily. Joy or sorrow, surprise or love, faith or curiosity, are known to drown and quench bodily pain.

The question, therefore, whether there is bodily "torture" in Hell is unimportant, if there is suffering at all. The truth is, the "popular" writers, such as Canon Farrar, make use of the natural shrinking we all have from the contemplation of pain as a convenient "point" on which to work up their rhetoric. As they treat the subject, it is a matter of word-painting and nothing else. Canon Farrar devotes a great part of his fourth and fifth sermons to the merest declamation, the most unblush-

* "It shall purify him, God grant, in due time; but oh! it shall agonize, because he has made himself, as yet, incapable of any other redemption" ("Eternal Hope," v. p. 133). And Mr. Jukes admits all through his pleading for Universal salvation the truth of what he expresses, when he says, "The fearful and unbelieving must pass through the lake of fire" ("The Restitution," p. 90).

ing phrase-making, about the "glaring (*sic*) agony of fire and brimstone for billions of years" (p. 91). He dare not deny, he distinctly states, that the condemned do suffer, and suffer "agony," "nemesis," "reddening doom," "fear," "shame," "aching crave," "conscience," "a scorch of fiery swords," a "Gehenna of æonian fire," and a number of other pains, which (if the words mean anything) signify, at the least, very intense mental and spiritual agony. If we understand anything about the life of spirits, all the physical horrors depicted by imaginative writers, from Tertullian to Mr. Spurgeon, are mere words and sound in comparison with what the reality must be. But the crowd understand no "pain" except physical pain. Their imaginations are bounded by what they are and what they feel. The awful experiences of the spirit in its "term" (that is, its probation over) are utterly beyond the range of their meditations. Unaccustomed to think upon the facts of spiritual existence, and without help from their spiritual guides, they do not conceive that a human being may suffer more in his soul than in his sense. On the other hand, modern sensitiveness to all that takes the shape of physical pain has increased and is increasing with every decade. Nothing, therefore, is better calculated to turn the minds of the unreflecting multitude against the revealed doctrine of Hell than harrowing and mocking descriptions of the bodily agonies which there await the sinner. Can it be that our Universalists and "Broad" theologians know this and calculate upon it? Can it be that the key to their denunciation of physical suffering hereafter, which is so illogical if they admit suffering at all, is the latent unwillingness to persuade themselves that there is any punishment whatever for man's rejection of his Maker?*

In truth, modern "sensitiveness" is the great obstacle to a belief in Eternal Punishment. In older days, death and pain and torture were not the object of such horror and shrinking as they have grown to be. But it is obvious to remark that mere sensitiveness is no guarantee whatever against the fact of pain. Pictures most horrible can be drawn by a man skilled in phrases and gifted with imagination, of death, disease, outrage, and suffering of every sort. Yet we know, as a fact, that death exists, and disease, and physical agony of a hundred kinds. Therefore this heated rhetoric, which makes the hearer shudder, is no proof whatever of the non-existence of pain everlasting.

* If it is agreed, says Professor Mayor (*Contemporary Review*, December, 1880, p. 1026) that the subject of punishment is an embodied soul, and the means of punishment pain, I do not see how the body can help bearing its share of pain.

But Canon Farrar is still more shocked—and tries to shock his readers—with the discovery that St. Thomas of Aquin holds that the blessed in Heaven will “rejoice” in the pains of the lost. He adds, what is of course true, that all Protestant writers on the subject have, until lately, held the same view. Such language he holds to be “inhuman.”* But it is the Protestant sermon-maker, utterly devoid of theological or philosophical training, who is irrational, not the ordinary view which is inhuman. First of all, the blessed in Heaven have none of that human and base lust of vengeance or anger such as we experience during our mortal life. All the movements or thrillings of the beatified corporeal nature are entirely subject to the spirit, so that no feeling or emotion stirs save when it is bidden. What St. Thomas says is that the blessed “enjoy their own happiness more, and give greater thanks to God”† when they are permitted to see the punishment of the lost. There is nothing here about *taking delight in the sufferings of the souls in Hell*. But even if St. Thomas had said, what has been undoubtedly said by weighty authorities, that the blessed “rejoice” in what they witness in the abyss of retribution, surely the view is a true one. The “joy” of a beatified saint means a pure, intellectual approval and a spiritual satisfaction. The lost soul has deliberately outraged God, and now obstinately hates Him. The necessary result is, punishment. Punishment is also, by the same necessity, God’s own holy will. The “joy” of the saint is wholly in this, that God is Master, that whatever stood against Him is cast down, and that eternal law is vindicated. But that the Blessed can have any touch of that poor, natural, base and human satisfaction in seeing another suffer “because he deserves it,” is a notion only worthy of that Protestant theology which measures Heaven by family life on earth, and can imagine no higher state of being than a continuation of the “moderate enjoyment” of the good things of this world. St. Thomas of Aquin and the Catholic divines had no such thoughts.

It is not necessary to deny that preachers and books have sometimes used language both on this point, and about the physical sufferings generally, which is far from being philosophically correct. The aim of the preacher of Hell is to present Hell vividly to the thought. He naturally makes use of corporeal images. He is so far warranted by strict theology that he may without hesitation preach eternal fire, and the pain of sense generally. If he introduces details where none are given

* “Eternal Hope,” p. 66.

† *Beatitudo sanctorum eis magis complaceat . . . uberiores gratias Deo . . . Summa Theol. iii. Suppl. Q. 94, art. 1.*

in Scripture or Catholic teaching, his hearers usually know that these details are in the nature of illustration. He usually says that what he describes may not be actually what will happen, but that his hearers may be quite sure the reality will be much worse. There is nothing reprehensible in this. Canon Farrar acts on precisely the same principle in his fifth sermon; for instance when he quotes a sickening passage from Dante in order to touch the imaginations of those he is addressing.* The question is one of taste and of efficiency. We believe, for our own part, that grotesque horrors, such as the late saintly Father Furness used to describe in his retreats, are bad in art and ineffective in result. As a rule they do not even frighten; and, if they did, fright is not always holy fear.

To sum up what has been said about the Suffering of Hell; first of all, it is impossible to picture or express the pain of loss, because the conditions under which our intellect works during mortal life do not enable us to "realize" the state of immortality. We can, therefore, only use analogical language. We know that fire, of a true and material sort, will act upon the souls and bodies of the lost.† We know that there will be pains of mind, and body—remorse, and physical suffering. We know that all these pains will vary in intensity in each different lost soul; some suffering many stripes, some few stripes.‡

We come now to the question of Hell's Eternity. It is, in many respects, the chief question of all; for the notion of Eternal Duration imparts to the idea of punishment an entirely new aspect. That which is grievous, may be unimportant provided it be short; but even a slight suffering, if it last for ever, is too great (it would seem) for human reason adequately to conceive.

* "Eternal Hope," p. 142.

† The question as to how a material agent like fire can affect a spirit such as the human soul is not touched here; not, however, because there is no plausible or probable view on the subject. (See Schæben, "Die Mysterien des Christenthums," p. 670.)

‡ St. Thomas clearly teaches that all who have come to the use of reason will be (finally) divided between Heaven and the Hell of the reprobate. (See "Summa," 1^a, 2^a, Art. 89, Qu. 6.) The teaching of this Article is remarkable in many ways, and fertile in consequences. (1) It makes an act of charity more easy than is generally supposed. If a child, or a savage, who is practically a child, chooses, or makes an act of the will towards what is good and right (*bonum honestum in confuso*), that child or savage is justified. Being incapable of anything better, and doing what lies in his power, his imperfect act is elevated to charity by grace. We may gather this from the Article, and from the interpretation of Cardinal Cajetan. (2) An act of contrition is not difficult. The child, or the uncultured savage, must turn to what is "good and right" as well as he can (*eo modo quo poterit*). Probably millions of savages can do no more than this. Thus millions are probably saved.

Consequently there have not been wanting, in every age of Christianity, men who have rejected the doctrine of the eternity of Hell on the ground of its incompatibility with right reason.* In the general anarchy, such as always ensues the moment that non-Catholic teachers lose hold of some portion of Catholic tradition, a number of divergent and discordant views are now being pressed upon Anglicans and Nonconformists. Some are anxiously proving that all men will ultimately be saved; this is Universalism, or Restorationism. Others are preaching Annihilationism, or Conditional Immortality—holding that the wicked, after being punished for a time, will then be destroyed. Between these views, and the extreme Protestant idea of Hell, there are innumerable varieties in various books and sermons; some teachers holding something very like Purgatory, others considering that *probation* will go on after death in the same way as now, and others again maintaining that, though all will have a chance in the next world, there will probably be some who, by remaining unrepentant, will endure an endless Hell.†

Let it be observed, in the first place, that we are not bound to be able to solve all difficulties which may be urged against a thesis which, from other sources, is abundantly proved. Even in matters of physical science, no one expects this. There are difficulties against the law of gravitation itself which cannot be solved. Yet no one thinks of doubting the existence of the law. Doubtless, if the objection amounted to a demonstration that a certain thesis was self-contradictory—that is to say, in the language of the schools, metaphysically impossible—we should then be obliged to abandon the thesis. But if the difficulty is plainly one which we cannot solve merely for want of materials or information or sufficient induction, right reason will only bid us wait and not necessarily doubt. And this applies with indefinitely greater force to difficulties urged against any doctrine into the statement of which there enters the great name of the Infinite. It is well known that two lines may have such relative properties that they may continually approach each other and yet never meet. If you inquire what would happen on the supposition that these lines were infinitely produced, no answer would be possible.

* "Shall not then the Judge of all the earth do right? Shall we say that sinful men are selfish and guilty, if with wealth and power they neglect the poor and miserable, and yet that God, who is eternal love, shall do what even sinful men abhor and reprobate? . . . If His children are for ever lost, He even more than they must be miserable." ("Restitution of all Things," pp. 115, 116.)

† This is Canon Farrar's view. (See "Eternal Hope," Preface, xiii.) It is strange he does see that it is simply open to all the rhetorical assaults which he has made upon the "common" doctrine.

On the one hand their inclination to one another is such that it can be *demonstrated* that they cannot possibly meet; on the other hand, the space between them, not being infinite, must be exhausted by a gradual approximation extending over an infinite period; and therefore they must meet. Now whatever may be said of the Mathematical Infinite, we can prove the Absolute Infinite to exist. This is as certain as anything that is. No one, therefore, has any right to be surprised if we meet with questions and difficulties in regard to the relations of the Infinite and the finite which refuse to be solved by reason.

The compatibility of the eternal pains of Hell with the justice and goodness of Almighty God depends on three points—Sin, Probation, and Immortality. All three are separately proved by Scripture and tradition, and all are perfectly consonant with sound reason. Immortality means that men, good or bad, live for ever; Probation means that death ends their time of trial and begins the duration of their fixed state. Of these we have already spoken. But a few words must still be said of Sin; because it is important to understand (as far as we can) the exact aspect of mortal sin which dooms the sinner to Eternal Punishment. Sin is punished for eternity, not precisely because the sinner can make no satisfaction for it, or cannot restore himself to the "order" and place from which he has fallen, or regain his spiritual life, or wipe out the stain of guilt. All this is found in mortal sin. But the reason why it is *everlastingly* punished is because it is an act of *measureless malice* against the Supreme God. There are two things which, to every rational creature, are, beyond all comparison, of absolute importance; one is, God, who is his Last End, the other is his personal attainment of that End. There we have the meaning, the scope, the regulating idea, of his very existence. All goodness, all justice, all bravery, all virtue, all good work, take their denomination from this primary thought; and so on the other hand do evil, iniquity, baseness and vice. The thoughts and the deeds which lead to God and the attainment of God are lovely, true, and good; the acts of heart and hand which are a rejection of Him are base, lying, and malicious. Now, an act of grievous sin, by deliberately and completely rejecting God, wrecks this primary "order." It would even beat down God, were that possible. This assertion, which is little understood and which is treated as a mere homiletic common-place, is really and literally true. God's very being is Omnipotence. Sin refuses to "serve," that is, to remain within the primary essential order. If it were possible that the sinner actually could escape outside this primary order, there would be no God. That which cannot be, the sinner deliberately chooses and prefers. Therefore the sinner wills to destroy God. Now

there is no "measure" possible for the unit of all measurement. You may measure the whiteness of the snow and the whiteness of the fleece; but the ideal from which you measure can only be stated, not measured. Malice is measured by its approach to the destruction of the primary order. But mortal sin actually destroys it—outraging the Supreme God, and wrecking the heart of man. There is no measure for malice of this kind. It is true, it may be compared with itself. One soul may drink it in more deeply than others. One grievous sin may be greater than another. But, apart from all degrees of intensity, every such sin has that in itself which is immeasurable by any standard known to human life or experience. It brings its retribution; and, as far as we can see by the light of reason, it is just and right that its retribution should have something of the immeasurableness of its own essence. There was no question of punishment actually infinite; infinitude and a creature are irreconcilable. But retribution might well be indefinite and never ending. Thus, whilst the justice of God and His eternal law mete out to each soul the degree of intensity which it has merited, every soul of the lost will remain under that punishment for all eternity. Yet even in Hell there is the mercy of God.

The dogma of the Eternity of Punishment cannot, it is admitted be proved from reason alone. It is God's revelation which makes us certain of it. Yet reason does not contradict it; nay, as we see, reason expects and anticipates it. But there is one objection or difficulty urged by Restorationists and by Agnostics alike—though by each for a different purpose—and it goes so close to the root of the mystery that it must be noticed. It is certainly true, they tell us, that God (in the Christian hypothesis) is both almighty and all-merciful. It may be that sin, as you maintain, deserves an eternity of punishment. But why does not God take measures to prevent sin? By bestowing some slight increase of His grace He could save all mankind. By refusing to do so He allows a part, perhaps the greater part, of His rational creation to be wrecked beyond redemption.

The answer to this will appear to some to be merely a restatement of the difficulty in other words. We maintain that Almighty God gives every man grace, which is truly and really sufficient to save him. Those who are lost use their free will to resist grace, and so fail and fall—for sin is failure and fall, not a positive and substantive act. God *could*, it is true, give them so much grace as to ensure that they would not fail. But there are no reasonable grounds for daring to suspect Him guilty of injustice because He does not. The creation of a rational creature implies free will, and free will implies that whatever is the object of free choice, or the result of free choice, the creature

may be justly abandoned to ; justly, as far as its own nature is concerned, for it has chosen it ; justly, as far as any eternal power or God Himself is concerned, because He simply leaves it to its nature.* This consideration entirely solves the imputation of injustice. But as for love and mercy, there are absolutely no data to go upon. Why does God give to one man what He does not give to another ? We do not know. For God's actions there is no cause outside of Himself. There is only one adumbration of a reason. Man is not merely a unit, but is the member of a system, of a universe. And we do not know how large or how complicated is the whole universe of creation. The principle end of Almighty God must, of necessity, be His own glory, and his secondary purpose, if we may so speak, must be the showing forth of His glory in creation as a whole. Thus He does not give His gratuitous gifts equally to all ; He rules as well as loves, He punishes as well as rewards, He is just and mighty as well as long-suffering and plenteous in mercy. It is no use to insist that a rational creature cannot justly be gifted with heart and feeling and then sacrificed to the symmetry of a system. The creature is not a victim. The creature chooses freely and is *left to its choice*. All through eternity it will never choose anything different.

If any one thinks this answer insufficient, let him remember we have, as facts, a Creator, creation, evil and inequality. Even on the wildest Universalist hypothesis, men will never be all equal. It is at this initial stage, therefore, that the mystery of God's distinguishing kindness confronts our reason. If it is a mystery involved in creation itself, and in the very fact—which is a matter of primary experience—that men suffer and are unequal ; and if, on the other hand, the hypothesis that God is not just or not merciful would involve us in a hundred mysteries darker far, then it would seem not hard for a mortal intellect to confess its blindness and its inability to measure the Infinite with the compasses of finite thought. Is there anything in Holy Scripture more persistently repeated than that God is incomprehensible ? And this means that, although we know what He is or does will never be in plain opposition to the reason He Himself has implanted in us, yet there must ever be abysses in His dealings which we cannot fathom, and exhibitions of His adorable attributes which we cannot by positive proof reconcile one with another.

One thing we are sure of, with a happy and blessed assurance, that no heart which turns to God by true repentance, however late the hour may be, can be separated from Him for ever. It

* Nature, in the context, does not of course abstract from grace.

would seem that, whatever controversy there was on other points, on this at least we should all agree. And yet strangely enough it is this very assurance which has been assailed in the latest contribution of the Universalist party to the discussion on punishment beyond the grave. Professor Mayor, in the late number of the *Contemporary Review*,* writes a letter, in which he professes to criticize the work of Dr. Pusey named at the head of this article. The criticism does not amount to much. He says that Dr. Pusey, representing traditionalism (as Professor Mayor represents "humanity"), offers two considerations in order to soften the dogma of Everlasting Punishment for sin: one is Purgatory, the other is the possibility of a death-bed repentance. He does not propose, he says, to say anything about Purgatory, but he proceeds to discuss the suggestion of repentance at the last moment. In doing so he betrays a want of—we will not say ordinary Christian information—but of rational ideas in regard to the soul and morality which we could hardly have conceived possible in an educated man. "Here, then," he says—speaking of repentance on the death-bed:—

We have the terms of capitulation offered by traditionalism to humanity. Allow us to keep the name and idea of hell, and we will no longer insist on Church membership, or orthodoxy, or even common morality, as indispensable. We will guarantee that the majority, at all events, shall escape, and indeed we see no reason why, with our system of death-bed repentance and protracted purgatory any one sinner should be finally lost.†

It may be confidently stated that it would be difficult to find a more glaring and bold perversion of Christian teaching. Why, what does death-bed repentance mean? It means a genuine and sincere sorrow for having neglected this very orthodoxy and morality, accompanied by a sincere resolution to behave for the future, if life continue, in exactly the opposite way. But on the next page we arrive at Professor Mayor's real philosophy. He says:—

(We cannot) believe it possible for such a change to take place in man's nature, in the final agony of death, that he who was a moment before out of grace, fixed in habits of sin, should, whilst he lies there apparently unconscious, *incapable of act*, or feeling or thought, by one *last effort of free will*, reverse the consequence of a life and enter into grace. Even supposing it to be possible . . . why should this particular wish have power to fix the state.§

We have italicised two phrases. Could any one but a modern Cambridge professor, blankly ignorant of all psychological science, calmly publish in print that a dying man who was incapable of

* December, 1880.

† P. 1027.

‡ P. 1028.

§ P. 1029.

act or thought might still make an effort of free will? But the whole passage is too unscientific to deserve refutation. 1. What does the Professor take "sin" to be? Surely an act of the will, and only of the will; so that if the adhesion of will be effectively withdrawn or reversed, the sin vanishes. Surely sin does not consist in habits, feelings, or such dispositions and states as are beyond the power of the will to alter in a moment? Reminiscences of early Calvinism, perhaps, are detected in this suggestion that a man may be a sinner in spite of his sincere desire to turn to God. 2. A death-bed repentance is, no doubt, a risk, an uncertainty, full of difficulty and anxiety. This the Catholic Church has always taught. But with consciousness and the use of reason, with God's grace, it is possible; and it must be possible, unless all morality be an affair of mere physical or mental growth, a sort of secretion, as we are now taught by a large school to regard it. 3. Habits are not sin. They may be caused by sin, and may make sin more frequent and more guilty; but so far as the will abhors and detests them, they are morally nothing more than the outside world or the attacks of the demon. 4. The act of death-bed repentance fixes the state for ever because it is the *last* act. The whole question of a period of probation is involved here, and cannot be dismissed with a sneer in a single line. 5. The long purification of Purgatory is expressly intended to purge and destroy those habits and dispositions of the complex nature of man which have been allowed to grow up in this world. But the moment the will rectifies itself by turning completely to its God, *mortal sin* is extinct, however difficult this turning may be. To speak otherwise would be to place the soul of man under the dominion of a gross and brutal necessity or fate. And it has been frequently and most justly remarked, that the misconception of what sin is lies at the root of the denial of eternal retribution. The common Protestant idea is that sin is the evil and condemned state in which all men are born; and that redemption makes no real change in the heart, but only overlooks the corruption it finds there. But no cultured man accepts the common Protestantism. The bias of the rationalizing party is more and more to consider the *act* of sin, as of little or no account, unless it hardens into a habit; thus placing the evil of sin, not in its rejection of God, but in its inconvenience to the sinner. The greater part of Canon Farrar's declamation amounts just to this, and to nothing less or more.

The moral to be drawn from any discussion such as the present, is, that the primary principles of our reason can always and with comparative ease be shown to accord with God's revelation; but that the conclusions drawn by the unassisted human thought from these first principles are likely to be so divergent in different

minds that nothing short of Revelation can make men agree in the most important matters of practice which concern their immortal souls. Revelation has its difficulties, but so has existence itself. Revelation has its mysteries, but so has rationalism. Meanwhile, the certainties which we rightfully hold must be held devoutly; and the difficulties may well wait their fuller solution in the light of a brighter day.

ART. VII.—ENDYMION.

Endymion. By the Author of "Lothair." In Three Volumes.
London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

THE advanced age of Lord Beaconsfield is of itself no reason why curiosity or wonder should be manifested at the appearance of another novel from his pen. Nor are his imaginative works so numerous as to make the addition of "*Endymion*" a portent. Mr. Anthony Trollope, Mr. Charles Reade, and several living lady authors, have long ago excelled him in the number of their productions, and still write with a large measure of their original vigour and freshness, while Victor Hugo is, by three years, Lord Beaconsfield's senior, and an incomparably more prolific novelist. Nor, again, although much of the interest in his writings is attributable to the high position he has won for himself in the political world, and the undoubted brilliancy of some of his ministerial achievements—is this by any means the entire explanation. The peculiar composition of his novels, more especially since "*Coningsby*"—a mixture of politics and passion—is the chief cause of their success. In style, Mr. Disraeli sets the critics, and in the choice of characters sets the canons of criticism, if not good taste itself, at defiance. To a wonderful extent he has always been a rule to himself, and the public, especially the English public, admire that quality even when they quarrel with some of its manifestations. Besides, though oftenest satirical, and writing best when satirical, the author can praise, can flatter, can be adulatory. "We are all in it," Society is said to have exclaimed, when it had read "*Vivian Grey*," and that pleased Society; the sharp thrusts at your neighbour's foibles soothed the irritation felt for the sharp thrusts at your own. In a true sense, also, Mr. Disraeli's novels are "revelations of high life"—perhaps not designedly so—written in that strain and style which make them not only intelligible but a positive luxury to the "wondering millions," as he designates them in "*Endy-*

mion," who foolishly like nothing better than gazing on the grandeur they can never possess.

Unfortunately, it must be added, that the novels hardly deserve more than this humiliating fate. "*Endymion*," and we are concerned for the moment with it only, certainly merits no higher success than to amuse by its frivolities the multitudes who are too frivolous to care for aught higher than mere amusement. Not that there have not been in Lord Beaconsfield's former works, and that there are not in "*Endymion*" sallies of wit, many gems of satire and epigram, and pieces of bright and sharp description, both of events and persons. But these do not sufficiently characterize his books—do not characterize "*Endymion*;" whilst there is no philosophy either of history or of political changes, no deep study of character or of the secret of success in public life. This is disappointing. It is natural to expect that the noble author would use the intimate acquaintance he must have with the hidden machinery of English politics for half a century back, to instruct while he amused. Shakespeare's historical plays at once suggest high models of how successfully dramatic ability may adorn the history it teaches—and teaches with an effect unique and lasting. But who understands the politics and the politicians of this century, or the import of their many and arduous legislative enactments from Lord Beaconsfield's novels? "*Endymion*," when the glitter of its grandeur has ceased to dazzle weak eyes, will be discovered by even weak eyes not to possess any power of teaching or improving—not even to possess any sufficient store of wealth, literary or humorous, to justify its being handed down to our children among the treasures of English literature.

These remarks, if they should appear at the moment somewhat sweeping or severe, will, we feel sure, be justified by an unprejudiced examination of the pages of "*Endymion*." There will not fail to be many—even admirers of Lord Beaconsfield's political career—who will feel genuine regret, not that a brilliant and successful statesman, a man who as it were yesterday, made the proud addition of "*Empress of India*" to the titles of England's sovereign, that he should occupy his leisure and advanced years in literary composition, but that doing so, he should not be able, or should not deem it worthy of him to try to charm men to a love of some noble purpose or to instruct them by the long garnered lessons of his own experience.

An outline, brief but sufficiently detailed, of the story of *Endymion* Ferrars, the hero from whom the book takes its name, will enable our readers to judge of the value of these strictures. Such an outline will be at once attempted. But we shall not trouble to take the book from the very beginning; because by a great

error of artistic judgment, the author does not begin to trace the story of his hero from the first. A considerable portion of the first volume, and a very heavy and laboured portion, deals with his father, and the series of political changes by which from a high position—"on the verge of the Cabinet"—he falls into what is described as ruin. That is to say, his party is out by the failure of the Duke of Wellington in 1832 to form a Cabinet, and again by Sir R. Peel's failure in 1834-5; and as he had lived very extravagantly in the expectation of place and its profits, he has to retire to an old manor-house in Berkshire named Hurstley, and there await the turn in fortune's tide that never came to him. Sir R. Peel, indeed, offered him a high post, once more, in the Government, but provided—and pocket boroughs were no more—he could secure a seat. All he got, therefore, and that scarcely enough to be an antidote to despair, was the promise of a clerkship in some office for his son Endymion. The family at Hurstley consisted of Mr. William Pitt Ferrars, his wife, and their twin children, Endymion and Myra.

Mrs. Ferrars, without being a regular beauty, had a voluptuous face and form. Her complexion was brilliant, with large and long-lashed eyes of blue. Her mouth was certainly too large, but the pouting richness of her lips and the splendour of her teeth, baffled criticism. She was a woman who was always gorgeously or fantastically attired. (Vol. i. p. 28.)

This is Mrs. Ferrars before her exile into the country, and the description is quoted, not for anything wonderful in it (although it might be pointed out that a complexion with large eyes is a phenomenon) for all the ladies in "*Endymion*" are transcendently beautiful, and are transcendently described, in detail—but because it is good to know one's hero's mother. The one feature in which Mrs. Ferrars was a model to her daughter was, in the elegance of her dresses. The children are worthy of their mother.

With the dessert, not without some ceremony, were introduced the two most remarkable guests of the entertainment, and these were the twins; children of singular beauty, and dressed, if possible, more fancifully and brilliantly than their mamma. They resembled each other, and had the same brilliant complexion, rich chestnut hair, delicately arched brows, and dark blue eyes. Though only eight years of age, a most unchildlike self-possession distinguished them. The expression of their countenances was haughty, disdainful, and supercilious. Their beautiful features seemed quite unimpassioned, and they moved as if they expected everything to yield to them. (Vol. i. p. 30.)

It is difficult to understand why the author has chosen to make these children of eight years, so repugnant. Myra tells a young private secretary that she will never marry any one who is not

in the House of Lords; and later, when Endymion tells her he cried very much when their great misfortune overtook them, she gibes him with softness: "I never cried in my life," she says, "except once with rage." If the author's object be to show how misfortune softens a proud heart, and changes a haughty manner, (and that would have been a moral lesson), he signally fails. Endymion is described as chastened and improved by the lesson, but Myra grows even worse, and when the sunshine of prosperity returns, her influence brings Endymion back to his first spirit of pride and ambition. He paints Myra in very repugnant colours; even making her measure out the amount of exterior tenderness to her father by the chance there is at the moment of a return to prosperity through his efforts.

When Endymion Ferrars set out for London in 1835, to become a clerk in one of the offices in Somerset House, he was neither dangerously vivacious, nor gifted with any "fatal facility of acquisition," but had great common sense, a painstaking disposition, and a clear mind. The last adieux of the three who remain behind are worth noticing. Mrs. Ferrars strains him to her in silence, then kisses him and gently motions him away. Mr. Ferrars, very much in the tone of a Minister dismissing an official, says: "I have entire confidence in you. Your business in life is to build up again a family which was once honoured:" Myra delivers her sentiments as follows, at the same time, as the author carefully informs us, "leaning back on the sofa." "Things are dark, and I fancy they will be darker; but brightness will come, somehow or other, to you, darling, for you are born to brightness. You will find friends in life, and they will be women." The brother and sister were at this interesting crisis only sixteen years of age.

Endymion stayed, at his first going to London, with Mr. and Mrs. Rodney, kind people, who had formerly been in his parents' service, and who now have a house in Warwick Street, and let their rooms to M.P.'s and the like. When Endymion arrives in Warwick Street, he finds Mr. Rodney seemingly "a most distinguished gentleman." Mrs. Rodney is a lady with a "very pretty" name—*Sylvia*, and her sister, who lives with her, is *Imogene*—"a brunette—a brilliant brunette."

With much trepidation Endymion makes his first appearance at Somerset House. The chief of his future department welcomes him cordially, and a "young man of pleasant address," Trenchard by name, introduces him to his future comrades. This is done with some good-humoured raillery on their individual points: Mr. Jawett is "the greatest radical of the age;" Mr. St. Barbe "will be the most popular author of the day when the public taste has improved;" Mr. Seymour Hicks "is a man of

fashion" and so on. But they were all courteous to Endymion, and as he sat to copy his first "long list of figures," Mr. St. Barbe was drawing up the following document:—

"We, the undersigned, highly approving of the personal appearance and manners of our new colleague, are unanimously of opinion that he should be invited to join our symposium to-day at the immortal Joe's."

This was quietly passed round and signed by all present, and then given to Mr. Trenchard, who, all unconsciously to the copying Endymion, wrote upon it, like a Minister of State, "Approved," with his initials.

Joe's, more technically known as "The Blue Posts," was a celebrated chop-house in Naseby Street, a large, low-ceilinged, wainscoted room, with the floor strewn with sawdust, and a hissing kitchen in the centre, and fitted up with what were called boxes, these being of various sizes, and suitable to the number of the guests requiring them. About this time the fashionable coffee-houses, George's and the Piazza, and even the coffee-rooms of Stevens's or Long's had begun to feel the injurious competition of the new clubs that of late years had been established; but these, after all, were limited, and, comparatively speaking, exclusive societies. Their influence had not touched the chop-houses, and it required another quarter of a century before their cheerful and hospitable roofs and the old taverns of London, so full, it ever seemed, of merriment and wisdom, yielded to the gradually increasing but irresistible influence of those innumerable associations, which, under classic names, or affecting to be the junior branches of celebrated confederacies, have since secured to the million, at cost price, all the delicacies of the season, and substituted for the zealous energy of immortal JOE, the inexorable, but frigid discipline of managing committees. (Vol. i. p. 172.)

At Joe's, therefore, Endymion was that day the guest of his new and good-natured comrades. After dinner "their talk was very political." Jawett was radical, and Trenchard for compromise. St. Barbe only gives faint indications of his utterly evasive disposition. Endymion, however, finds more congenial enjoyment with the Rodneys; listening to Mr. Rodney's anecdotes of great statesmen, or chatting with Imogene, while a game of cards goes on among a "few young men" generally there of an evening, who "were evidently gentlemen," and one of whom Mr. Rodney had casually told Endymion "might some day even be a peer of the realm." "When there were cards, there was always a little supper; a lobster and a roasted potato and that sort of easy thing;" indeed, the little suppers at Warwick Street are more than once recalled with fond remembrance later on in life by some of those who took part in them.

At this early period of his career, Endymion made the acquaintance at the Rodneys of one who became a great admirer and a

substantial friend. This was Mr. Vigo, a Yorkshire man, and "the most fashionable tailor in London." He was more than a mere cutter of clothes; he was a counsellor and friend to the "golden youth," who repaired to his counters. There was a spacious room at Vigo's. Vigo's cigars were unrivalled, and equally unrivalled in its way was his Johannisberg hock. Endymion won the good graces of Mr. Vigo at first meeting, and was asked to call on that gentleman at his shop. "What I wish to do in your case," said the good-natured tailor, with little preface, "is what I have done in others and some memorable ones. I shall enter your name in my books for an unlimited credit, and no account to be settled till you are a Privy Councillor." Endymion naturally hesitates, but Mr. Vigo overrules his shyness, and thus lays down the canons of dress—

"I have known many an heiress lost by her suitor being ill-dressed," said Mr. Vigo. "You must dress according to your age, your pursuits, your object in life; you must dress, too, in some cases, according to your set. In youth a little fancy is rather expected, but if political life be your object, it should be avoided, at least after one-and-twenty. I am dressing two brothers now, men of considerable position; one is a mere man of pleasure, the other will probably be a Minister of State. They are as like as two peas, but were I to dress the dandy and the Minister the same, it would be bad taste—it would be ridiculous. No man gives me the trouble which Lord Eglantine does; he has not made up his mind whether he will be a great poet or Prime Minister. 'You must choose, my lord,' I tell him. 'I cannot send you out looking like Lord Byron if you mean to be a Canning or a Pitt.' I have dressed a great many of our statesmen and orators, and I always dressed them according to their style and the nature of their duties. What all men should avoid is the shabby genteel. No man ever gets over it. I will save you from that. You had better be in rags." (Vol. i. p. 213.)

Nature having endowed our hero with great beauty and winning manners, and Fortune having now presented him with the most fashionable tailor in London, it will be guessed that in Lord Beaconsfield's hands he is destined to become a brilliant success.

The monotony of Endymion's life at Somerset House is broken by two sad events. At his first Christmas at home his mother dies. This is a great blow to the boy, and is soon followed by another equally great. In one of the most dramatic scenes in the book he is suddenly called home to learn from a friend that his father had committed suicide. When he meets Myra, "her face was grave, but not a tear even glistened." When the effects at the hall had been sold, and bills paid from the proceeds of the sale, and there was nothing left—Endymion naturally wishes Myra to live with him.

"That would ensure our common ruin," said Myra. "No; I will never embarrass you with a sister. You can only just subsist; for you could not well live in a garret, except at the Rodneys. I see my way. I have long meditated over this—I can draw, I can sing, I can speak many tongues: I ought," said Myra, "to be able to get food and clothing; I may get something more. And I shall always be content; for I shall always be thinking of you. However humble even my lot, if my will is concentrated on one purpose, it must ultimately effect it. That is my creed," she said, "and I hold it fervently." (Vol. i. p. 270.)

This creed is so frequently sung throughout the course of "Endymion" by several characters, but most frequently by Myra, that considering its only partial truth and limited application and the startling fact that good fortune, not indomitable will, is the good fairy of the story, we get rather tired of it. Myra sees an advertisement in the *Times*, and through it obtains a place in the family of Adrian Neuchatel as his daughter's companion. This daughter's name was Adriana; she was the "greatest heiress in England," and—transcendently beautiful; *ça va sans dire*. The Neuchatels are described as "one of the most remarkable families that have ever flourished in England." They are very rich and flourishing bankers, and Adrian's residence, Hainault House, is described in the most gorgeous and superlative language. The stables "had been modelled on those at Chantilly;" fifty persons worked in the stables, as many more in the park and garden, "the conservatories and forcing-houses looked in the distance like a city of glass." But the portion of the establishment "best appreciated" was the kitchen. "The *chef* was the greatest celebrity of Europe," and every dinner was a banquet.

This generous host invited all classes of men—brokers, bankers, M.P.'s, literary, and other public men, even privy councillors. Adrian did not fear their resenting each others presence. He was a philosopher:

"Turtle makes all men equal," Adrian would observe. "Our friend Trodgit's seemed a little embarrassed at first when I introduced him to the Right Honourable; but when they sate next each other at dinner, they soon got on very well." (Vol. i. p. 277.)

Mrs. Neuchatel is the only lady, so far as we can recall, in the whole book who is not absolutely beautiful; and she is a contrast in some other respects. Brought up in wealth, and married to a man whose wealth is boundless, she had not merely a contempt for money, but absolutely a hatred of it. She loved Nature, and science and literature; cared nothing for politics, and was, as her husband said, "a regular Communist"—she thought wealth ought to be re-distributed; the wants of the poor

interfered with the enjoyment of her own grandeur. The daughter of this unworldly woman also loves books and Nature; is haunted with the persuasion that she is courted and admired only for her wealth. To counteract the growth of this dismal monomania, her parents seek for a companion of her own age. Hence the *Times* advertisement and Myra's entrance into the family. The Neuchatels have no snobbishness about them, and soon make Myra quite one of their inner circle, and Endymion, as her brother, is always welcome. It will be seen, therefore, that chance had favoured Myra, and that she is not called upon to work or to sacrifice much for the advancement of her brother. They both meet many elegant and aristocratic personages at the house of the Neuchatels. Amongst them Myra finds a titled husband; she marries Lord Roehampton. After she had accepted him, she tells Endymion with sisterly frankness—

"Lord Roehampton has every quality and every accident of life that I delight in; he has intellect, eloquence, courage, great station and power; and, what I ought perhaps more to consider, though I do not, a sweet disposition and a tender heart. . . . The world will talk of the disparity of our years; but Lord Roehampton says that he is really the younger of the two, and I think he is right. My pride, my intense pride, never permitted me any levity of heart." (Vol. ii. p. 91.)

It was also at the Neuchatels that Myra met Colonel Albert, who was to affect the course of her life in later years. Endymion also meets Colonel Albert, about whom there is some mystery hanging, and recognizes him as the Count of Otranto, to whom he had been fag at Eton. When this mysterious person finally unveils himself, he is no other than Prince Florestan, the son of Queen Agrippina, and the claimant of a great foreign throne. Prince Florestan admires Myra both before and after her marriage, looks upon her as a paragon of all feminine perfections and as (what doubtless she was) an extremely clever woman. How far Prince Florestan is a representation of Louis Napoleon, or Lord Roehampton of Lord Palmerston, no attempt shall here be made to say; the composition of a "key" to "Endymion" would be incomparably more difficult a task than was that to "Vivian Grey." Endymion feared being quizzed by his fellow clerks at Somerset House about this grand marriage of his sister. But he was not bantered.

The event was too great for a jest. Seymour Hicks, with a serious countenance, said Ferrars might go anywhere now—all the Ministerial receptions of course. Jawett said there would be no Ministerial receptions soon; they were degrading functions. Clear-headed Trenchard congratulated him quietly, and said, "I do not think you will stay much longer among us, but we shall always remember you with interest." (Vol. ii. p. 97.)

He does not stay much longer among them, as the reader also will anticipate; Myra's brilliant social advancement operates also to his advantage. The first change in his position was that everybody was suddenly anxious to honour, notice, or know "Lady Roehampton's brother." Invitations were showered upon him. These empty advantages were, however, followed by a more substantial one—one that made indeed a great crisis in his life. Mr. Sidney Wilton, a colleague of Lord Roehampton in the Cabinet, offers Lady Roehampton, for her brother, a clerkship in his office at £300 a year, together with the post of his own private secretary at £300 more. Myra characteristically accepts this for Endymion without consulting him, and, in addition, herself takes a suit of rooms for him in the Albany. Endymion ascends the ladder of his sister's ambition.

Endymion had now passed three years of his life in London, and considering the hard circumstances under which he had commenced his career, he might on the whole look back to those years without dissatisfaction. Three years ago he was poor and friendless, utterly ignorant of the world, and with nothing to guide him but his own good sense. . . . Through the Rodneys he had become acquainted with a certain sort of miscellaneous life, a knowledge of which is highly valuable to a youth, but which is seldom attained without risk. Endymion on the contrary, was always guarded from danger. Through his most unexpected connection with the Neuchatel family, he had seen something of life in circles of refinement and high consideration, and had even caught glimpses of that great world of which he read so much and heard people talk more, the world of the Lord Roehamptons and the Lady Montforts, and all those dazzling people whose sayings and doings form the taste, and supply the conversation, and leaven the existence of admiring and wondering millions. (Vol. ii. p. 58.)

These last words would merit to be set in italics if they were the composition of any one but the author of "*Lothair*."

When Endymion comes to the task of leaving the Rodneys, he experienced some very commendable sadness. Warwick Street, had been a real home to him. When he came to analyse his feelings he attributes the sadness to having to part from Imogene. In truth, he had fallen in love with her, and the reader of "*Endymion*" will think very rightly. She is described as having more of the true and tender woman about her than any other of the female characters in the book. She had been markedly kind and sisterly, and withal considerate, in her assiduous care for his wants and comforts ever since the first night he came under their roof. Endymion once allows himself to brood and dream of what might be—of Imogene as his wife: of his home in a little suburban villa, with a garden of perpetual sunshine before it, and Imogene waiting in it *for him* as he

came down from town and his daily labour, in "the cheap and convenient omnibus." But Endymion comes quickly back from dreamland to waking life—and ambitious Myra. He does not marry Imogene, apparently because Lord Beaconsfield holds £600 a year to be insufficient, even with a good wife, for a man's happiness. It did not occur to Endymion, he says, "that the garden could not always be sunshiny . . . and that wanting money, he would return too often from town a harassed husband to a jaded wife." *Non sequitur*; "harassed" and "jaded" are impressive words, but are there no happy homes—the homes, too, of noble (not titled, but noble for all that), gifted, and even ambitious, men—in semi-detached suburban villas?

Berengaria, Lady Montfort, is one day the unexpected guest at dinner of Mr. Wilton. He, after dinner—the guests had been miscellaneous and not high—"thought it necessary to observe that he feared Lady Montfort had been bored."

"I have been, and am, extremely amused," she replied, "and now tell me, who is that young man at the very end of the table?"

"That is my private secretary, Mr. Ferrars."

"Ferrars!"

"A brother of Lady Roehampton."

"Present me to him after dinner."

* * * * *

Mr. Wilton led Endymion up to Lady Montfort at once, and she immediately inquired after his sister. "Do you think," she said, "Lady Roehampton would see me to-morrow if I called on her?"

"If I were Lady Roehampton, I would," said Endymion.

Lady Montfort looked at him with a glance of curious scrutiny; not smiling, and yet not displeased. "I will write her a little note in the morning," said Lady Montfort thoughtfully, "one may leave cards for ever. Mr. Wilton tells me you are quite his right hand."

"Mr. Wilton is too kind to me," said Endymion. "One could not be excused for not doing one's best for such a master." (Vol. ii. p. 142.)

Lady Montfort is to be henceforth *the* chief factor in shaping the career and moulding the life of our modern Endymion. She is the goddess of Lord Beaconsfield's myth.

The husband of this high-born lady, Simon, Earl of Montfort, is one of the most carefully drawn characters in the book. Something very like him has, however, appeared before from the author's pen, when, years ago, it traced the figure of Lord Monmouth in "Coningsby." The Earl of Montfort is a great and rich nobleman, clever, but eccentric. His domains are vast, his castle in the north is "one of the glories of the land." He willingly sacrificed numerous boroughs for the success of Lord Grey's Reform Bill, and soon afterwards left England for years—and at last settled down at Paris "in Sybaritic seclusion." He has, however, at the time we meet him, returned to England, and lives

there, but finds interest in nothing. He has tried everything (except politics which he will have none of), and found all forms of human enjoyment empty and worthless. He was captivated by Lady Berengaria and married her—but soon grew careless, and content that half the length of England should generally separate them. With most women this would have led to a public scandal, but Berengaria was “as remarkable as a woman as the bridegroom was in his sex,” and she had tact and even genius enough to establish a *modus vivendi* with this invariably polite, selfish, and unprincipled old—villain, one would think appropriate, if vulgar, but Lord Beaconsfield has no scorn for even such a man as this. Because of his fine figure and his veneering of courtly politeness, he is even the only specimen remaining of “a nobleman of the eighteenth century”—more’s the pity for the eighteenth century. If he had been too poor to be trained to an imperturbable exterior of grace and affability, he would have become by force of character and disposition a low scoundrel, as defiant of the rules of “society” as he actually is of the Ten Commandments. But Lord Beaconsfield’s tone in these clever, witty descriptions, is never serious, hence, perhaps, his style is never simple—to be piquant and bright is his aim. Indeed, how far he intends us to understand any opinion or sentiment to be his own, it is impossible with certainty to decide. A few lines, therefore, to justify our own opinion of Lord Montfort:—

There was no subject human or divine in which he took the slightest interest. He entertained for human nature generally, and without any exception, the most cynical appreciation. . . . Society was intolerable to him; that of his own sex and station wearisome beyond expression; their conversation consisted only of two subjects, horses and women, and he had long exhausted both. As for female society, if they were ladies, it was expected that, in some form or other, he should make love to them, and he had no sentiment. If he took refuge in the *demi-monde* he encountered vulgarity, and that, to Lord Montfort, was insufferable. He had tried them in every capital, and vulgarity was the badge of all their tribe. . . . No one could say Lord Montfort was a bad-hearted man, for he had no heart. He was good-natured provided it brought him no inconvenience; and as for temper, his was never disturbed, but this not from sweetness of disposition, rather from a contemptuous fine taste, which assured him that a gentleman should never be deprived of tranquillity in a world where nothing was of the slightest consequence. (Vol. ii. p. 158.)

Lady Montfort, at the epoch when Endymion was introduced to her, had for her one occupation to humour this monster by sending down to him to his house in the country people who would amuse him. African travellers who, as she says, may tell him all they saw, and as much more as they like; men of wit, or science, men qualified, in any way to amuse for a day or two—

no one amuses him for a lengthened period—are asked down, and have the fine living and the privilege as an abundant return. His wife writes to him every day; her letters, she says, he prefers to her society—they amuse him. But she is devoted to him, and even loves him. Lady Montfort soon takes an even greater interest in Endymion than does his own sister; she allows him to visit her constantly, even desires it—we hear irreverent outsiders later on mention Endymion as Lady Montfort's poodle—and he himself comes at a subsequent crisis in affairs to acknowledge that he cannot imagine a happy day in his life on which he does not see her.

The story of Endymion has now reached 1839. "The extreme popularity of the Sovereign"—(her present Majesty)—"reflecting some lustre on her Ministers, had enabled them, though not without difficulty, to tide through the session of 1838." When, however, Parliament meets in 1839, the prospect is dark; for there was a section of extreme Liberals who would have been content that the Government should be overthrown. Ladies Montfort and Roehampton "opened their houses to the general world at an unusually early period." But the social efforts of Zenobia in the Whig interest were not less brilliant. "Her radiant face" was "prescient of triumph" as she would inquire from any friends she met for the names of the Radical members who wanted to turn out the Government; "I will invite them directly," she says. Late in 1840 the existence of the Ministry becomes extremely hazardous. Later, again, Sir R. Peel's resolution of want of confidence is carried by a majority of one, and the Ministry resolve on dissolution. Endymion shall go into the new Parliament—so both Myra and Lady Montfort decide, and in reply to his difficulties and doubts they both preach (in more outrageous terms than ever) that everything in this world depends on *will*. There is a great deal of nonsense talked by these two ladies at this crisis—quite unworthy of Lord Beaconsfield's *otium cum dignitate*. Endymion needs money, and he finds one day among his letters, one containing "a scrip receipt for £20,000 Consols, purchased that morning in the name of Endymion Ferrars, Esq." The gift was anonymous, and will be acknowledged to be a very splendid *deus ex machina*, and worthy of a book whose hero, it is the aim of the author to show, conquers the world by force of will.

Endymion enters Parliament unopposed, and is soon on the opposition side of the House. It is impossible to avoid quoting the following significant instructions of Lady Montfort to Endymion as she sends him off during the recess to Paris, "the capital of diplomacy," to study men and manners, promising to meet him there if she can:—

Finance and commerce are everybody's subjects, and are most convenient to make speeches about for men who cannot speak French, and who have had no education. Real politics are the possession and distribution of power. I want to see you give your mind to foreign affairs. There you will have no rivals. . . . But foreign affairs are not to be mastered by mere reading. Bookworms do not make Chancellors of State. You must become acquainted with the great actors in the great scene. There is nothing like personal knowledge of the individuals who control the high affairs. That has made the fortune of Lord Roehampton. (Vol. iii. p. 34.)

"A love of power, a passion for distinction, a noble pride which had been native to his early disposition," and had been crushed by early sorrows, now revived in the soul of Endymion. The reader will please to note the moral grandeur of the three springs of action which the author delights to say reasserted their original place and momentum in the life of his hero.

Lord Roehampton now commissions Endymion to put a foreign policy question of importance. This notice was the first time that Endymion had spoken in the House. His feelings as he rises are partly a repetition of those attending his first debating speech.

When he sat down he was quite surprised that the business of the House proceeded as usual, and it was only after sometime that he became convinced that no one but himself was conscious of his suffering, or that he had performed a routine duty otherwise than in a routine manner. (Vol. iii. p. 112.)

To the surprise of everyone, the Minister himself answered Endymion's question. The process being repeated at intervals, brings Endymion into notice and prepares him for coming promotion. Then we have another defeat of the Ministry, and once again Lord Roehampton is Secretary of State. Endymion is appointed to the post under him. Towards the end of the year Lord Roehampton was called up to the House of Lords, and Endymion was told he must represent the Foreign Office in the House of Commons. Unexpectedly, but not quite without warning, for he had been ailing for some time past and forbidden business at his peril, Lord Roehampton is found dead in his chair. His State papers were on the table before him; he had died a victim of devotion to the interests of his country. The reader can now foresee the near conclusion. "Well, but what am I to do?" says the Prime Minister, in a *tête-à-tête* to Lady Montfort, "I cannot make Mr. Ferrars Secretary of State." "Why not?" says Berengaria. The Minister was perplexed; "he had been educated in high Whig routine, and the proposition of Lady Montfort was like recommending him to make a curate a bishop."

Meanwhile, Prince Florestan—who, under various aliases, has since the commencement of the story mixed much with our friends at various English houses—makes a sudden and bold descent on his own country. When an army is drawn up to oppose his passage through the mountains—perhaps the Pyrenees, he gallops up to the hostile lines, with a white handkerchief tied to his sword, and cries out, “‘My men, this is the sword of my father.’ ‘Florestan for ever,’ was the only and universal reply.” He enters his delightful capital amidst *vivas*, and was soon occupied with the very important subject of taking a wife. In a chapter which aims at being very dramatic, and is so in part, Myra, now once more in society, is going to a ball to be given by Lady Montfort, at which royalty itself was to appear as a guest. Myra—in the author’s usual style—dresses for this event with such effect that, as for a moment before going she stands reflected in a mirror, she is a “fair vision.” Then she is described as a “transcendent beauty,” and a series of details are given, with a remark about “the voluptuous undulations of her shoulders”—that we might forgive Lord Beaconsfield if he were writing his first novel. A letter is here suddenly handed to her in which Prince Florestan says, *inter alia*, “I can offer you nothing equal to your transcendent merit, but I can offer you the heart and the throne of Florestan.” Few novelists would venture to place the action of their story only a quarter of a century back, and offer their heroine the throne of one of the first countries of Europe. But Lord Beaconsfield does it. A long and terrible soliloquy follows, during which the clock strikes more than once unheeded, and then Myra suddenly rings the bell.

“I shall not want the carriage to-night,” she said, and when again alone, she sat down and, burying her face in *her alabaster arms*, for a long time remained motionless.

The italics are ours—the bathos is the author’s. Myra, it need not be said, consents to marry King Florestan. She becomes a Catholic, and is married in her new capital with great solemnity. A wife for Endymion is the only thing that is needed for a book that has now exhausted the dramatic powers of the author. But it lingers on for many pages and chapters, during the course of which we get rid of Lord Montfort, learn that Lady Montfort has been left immensely rich, and then read in a very curious chapter how she proposes to Endymion—and is accepted. Was this done merely that the hero of Will might not win even his wife by any effort of his own? or was it that to this Endymion also,

Like Dian’s kiss, *unasked*, unsought,
Love gives itself?

We part from Endymion and his wife just as he has evidently

been asked to be Prime Minister—the summit of his sister's and wife's ambition for him.

A large share of the interest manifested at the appearance of the novel under notice, is doubtless to be attributed to the remembrance of what manner of book "*Lothair*" was. The special purpose of "*Lothair*" was to attack the Catholic Church in England and those who joined it. And the author did not hesitate to give vent in it to his feelings and judgments concerning living persons who were veiled indeed under fictitious names, but so cleverly described as to be unmistakable. This method not only gave piquancy to sarcasm and insinuation, and made even spite picturesque, but the exact line between the exaggeration of the novelist, and the deliberate belief of the assailant, could not be clearly drawn. People who hated us preferred "*Lothair*" to a ponderous controversial projectile; their bitterness found relief and amusement simultaneously; it relieves the heart more to laugh at people you dislike than even to prove them in the wrong—moreover, the book was, from its nature, unanswerable. Curiosity was, therefore, roused: would "*Endymion*" repeat this style of attack—and on whom? But not one of the dramatis personæ in "*Endymion*" is such a representation from life as can be dealt with seriously. Waldershare, Lord Roehampton, Prince Florestan, Mr. Vigo, and several others, have been recognized: and there are descriptions, whether of appearance or discourse, so characteristic of Mr. George Smythe, Lord Palmerston, Louis Napoleon, Mr. George Hudson and others, that the representation seems intended and successful. But as the story proceeds, they act, speak, quite like some other persons, or they are placed in circumstances impossible to their supposed originals. The appearance of two distinct figures thrown by the magic-lantern on the same space, and mixing into one confused and puzzling whole—would not be more incongruous than the character results in "*Endymion*." Prince Florestan does both politically and socially what Napoleon never did; becomes what Napoleon never could become, a king. One competent critic has recognized in Job Thornberry, Mr. Cobden, another has recognized Mr. John Bright. Neither of them like the sketch, however, and it may fairly be assumed that nothing can save some of the sketches from the charge of unfairness, except the absence of any standard by which to test the intention of the writer. We have another character—Nigel Penruddock—occupying not a little space from the beginning of the book to the end, that has already been generally accepted as an amalgam of the career of the late Cardinal Wiseman with the personality of our present Archbishop. But even this is not quite all—for the novelist depicts youthful antecedents of the convert clergyman that

are fictitious. No remark about the good taste of these gratuitous strokes is needed; partly because it may be doubted how far Nigel Penruddock has been voluntarily drawn from any one living person. He shall be described. Nigel's father was the rector at Hurstley when the Ferrars went into retirement there. Nigel comes home occasionally from Oxford, and we are told he was a "student, and devoted to the holy profession for which he was destined." He was a sportsman, too, and "his Christianity was muscular." On one of their fishing excursions, Nigel says:—

"What does Mr. Ferrars mean you to be, Endymion?"

"I do not know," said Endymion, looking perplexed.

"But I suppose you are to be something?"

"Yes; I suppose I must be something; because papa has lost his fortune."

"And what would you like to be?"

"I never thought about it," said Endymion.

"In my opinion there is only one thing for a man to be in this age," said Nigel peremptorily; "he should go into the church."

"The church?" said Endymion.

"There will soon be nothing else left," said Nigel. "The church must last for ever. It is built upon a rock. It was founded by God; all other governments have been founded by men. When they are destroyed, and the process of destruction seems rapid, there will be nothing left to govern mankind except the church!"

"Indeed!" said Endymion; "papa is very much in favour of the church, and, I know, is writing something about it."

"Yes, but Mr. Ferrars is an Erastian," said Nigel; "you need not tell him I said so, but he is one. He wants the church to be the servant of the State, and all that sort of thing, but that will not do any longer. This destruction of the Irish bishoprics has brought affairs to a crisis. No human power has the right to destroy a bishopric. It is a divinely-ordained office, and when a diocese is once established, it is eternal."

* * * * *

Endymion did not fail to give a report of this conversation and similar ones to his sister, for he was in the habit of telling her everything. She listened with attention, but not with interest, to his story. Her expression was kind, but hardly serious. Her wondrous eyes gave him a glance of blended mockery and affection. "Dear darling," she said, "if you are to be a clergyman, I should like you to be a cardinal." (Vol. i. p. 116.)

Soon after Mrs. Ferrars' death, Nigel proposes to Myra, and is distinctly refused by her—which we feel intensely glad of, for Nigel's sake. Later on, Nigel comes to London to what is apparently a fashionable church; he is an eloquent preacher, yet preaches as effectually by his example. Lady Montfort and other great ladies become his friends and helpers. The following

extract explains itself, but the latter portion seems to us to savour of the tone of yet another cardinal :—

"I know nothing about politics," said Nigel. "By being moderate and temperate in politics, I suppose you mean being adroit, and doing that which is expedient and which will probably be successful. But the Church is founded on absolute truth, and teaches absolute truth, and there can be no compromise on such matters."

"Well, I do not know," said Endymion, "but surely there are many very religious people who do not accept without reserve everything that is taught by the Church. . . . Do you mean to say that I am to be considered an infidel or an apostate because, although I fervently embrace all the vital truths of religion, and try, on the whole, to regulate my life by them, I may have scruples about believing, for example, in the personality of the devil?"

"If the personality of Satan be not a vital principle of your religion, I do not know what is. There is only one dogma higher. You think it is safe, and I daresay it is fashionable to fall into this lax and really thoughtless discrimination between what is and what is not to be believed. It is not good taste to believe in the Devil. Give me a single argument against his personality which is not applicable to the personality of the Deity. Will you give that up; and if so, where are you? Now mark me; you and I are young men—you are a very young man. This is the year of grace 1839. If these loose thoughts, which you have heedlessly taken up, prevail in this country for a generation or so—five-and-twenty or thirty years—we may meet together again, and I shall have to convince you that there is a God." (Vol. ii. p. 185.)

The descriptions of Nigel's career are always intended to be friendly. He is a popular preacher, but disdains "all cant and clap-trap," and neglects no other of his multitudinous duties for the sake of the pulpit. Lady Roehampton even induces my lord to go on one Sunday, and he "was very much struck indeed by what he had heard." Lady Montfort afterwards gave up Nigel's church; not through caprice, as was hinted :—

"I like a man to be practical," she said. "When I asked a deanery for him the other day, the Prime Minister said he could hardly make a man a dean who believed in the Real Presence." (Vol. ii. p. 292.)

Nigel Penruddock goes to Rome, becomes a Catholic, a priest, an archbishop *in partibus*, and returns to England the Pope's legate. "The conversion of England was deeply engraved on the heart of Penruddock; it was his constant purpose, and his daily and nightly prayer." When Myra consented to become the wife of King Florestan, Nigel received her into the Church. Endymion told Lady Montfort :—

"There is no difficulty and no great ceremonies in such matters. She was re-baptized, but only by way of precaution. It was not necessary, for our orders, you know, are recognized by Rome."

"And that was all?"

"All, with a first communion and confession. It is all consummated now; as you say: 'It is too wonderful.' A first confession, and to Nigel Penruddock, who says life is flat and insipid!" (Vol. iii. p. 242.)

The mistaken connection between "our orders" and re-baptizing a convert need not be pointed out to Catholic readers. A layman can baptize as validly as a priest; but, especially at the period of which Lord Beaconsfield here writes, the care of Protestant clergymen to observe the essentials of the sacrament of baptism could not be presumed by the Church. Cardinal Penruddock is made to play the part of Cardinal Wiseman in the restoration of the English hierarchy. When the Pope's Bull and the Cardinal's pastoral letter became known in England

The country at first was more stupefied than alarmed. It was conscious that something extraordinary had happened, and some great action taken by an ecclesiastical power, which, from tradition, it was ever inclined to view with suspicion and fear. But it held its breath for a while. It so happened that the Prime Minister was a member of a great house which had become illustrious by its profession of Protestant principles, and even by its sufferings in a cause which England had looked upon as sacred. The Prime Minister, a man of distinguished ability, not devoid even of genius, was also a wily politician, and of almost unrivalled experience in the management of political parties. The Ministry was weak and nearly worn out, and its chief, influenced partly by noble and historical sentiments, partly by a conviction that he had a fine occasion to rally the confidence of the country round himself and his friends, and to restore the repute of his political connections, thought fit, without consulting his colleagues, to publish a manifesto denouncing the aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as insolent and insidious, and as expressing a pretension of supremacy over the realm of England, which made the Minister indignant.

A confused public wanted to be led, and now they were led. They sprang to their feet like an armed man. The Corporation of London, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, had audiences of the Queen; the counties met, the municipalities memorialized; before the first of January there had been held nearly seven thousand public meetings, asserting the supremacy of the Queen, and calling on Her Majesty's Government to vindicate it by stringent measures.

Unfortunately, it was soon discovered by the Minister that there had been nothing illegal in the conduct of the Pope or the Cardinal, and a considerable portion of the Liberal party began to express the inconvenient opinion, that the manifesto of their Chief was opposed to those principles of civil and religious liberty of which he was the hereditary champion. Some influential members of his own Cabinet did not conceal their disapprobation of a step on which they had not been consulted. (Vol. iii. p. 308.)

When Parliament met, however, the House of Commons was discontented, and the Ministry itself divided. "The anti-papal manifesto was the secret cause of this evil state, but the Prime Minister, to avoid such a mortifying admission, took advantage of two unfavourable divisions on other matters, and resigned."

There is one other character drawn with much minuteness in the pages of "*Endymion*," in which we feel some interest, because it is neither an aristocrat nor a politician, and more interest because it has been accepted by the critics as a picture of a great English novelist. That "*Topsy-Turvy*" is intended for "*Vanity Fair*" there can be little doubt; but, in the absence of any more distinct indication, we feel slow to admit that even Lord Beaconsfield could be so rash and spiteful as to intend the character and sayings of St. Barbe for even a satirical sketch of W.M. Thackeray. Even if St. Barbe be Thackeray, and Thackeray was guilty of writing "*Codlingsby*"—yet, as Mr. Anthony Trollope points out in his sketch of Thackeray,* not a line of it spoils whatever appreciation we may beforehand have had of "*Coningsby*" itself. As for Thackeray's character—the opposite of St. Barbe's, read Mr. Trollope's recent biography or any unprejudiced account. One quality Thackeray manifested in "*Vanity Fair*" as in all his works: he scorned vice and painted it so that you scorned it too. Lord Hertford, it is said, sat for both novelists, but Lord Monmouth is as fine a gentleman as is Lord Montfort, but you hate the Marquis of Steyne. Few remarks, if any, are requisite as to the style of "*Endymion*." It is by the author of "*Lothair*" and very like "*Lothair*" in style—more subdued, and neither so animated nor so witty as the author's earlier novels. Still the air is oppressively grand—the wealth of jewellery is even more unbounded—everybody is either titled or aiming thereat; the figures in the scene are the cream of society or struggling to enter what the author calls the "spell-bound ranks." All is artificial, if refined—it is Nature spoiled by false Art. There are no spades in the story—nothing so common—but any plain word has to give place to periphrasis or a mistaken artificiality. Thus, Imogene tells Endymion:—

"Mr. Waldershare in educating me, as he says, as a princess, has made me really neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, nor even that coarser but popular delicacy never forgotten." (Vol. ii. p. 131.)

Thus, again, people in "*Endymion*" rarely speak, they murmur, they rarely walk, they glide, while actually at page 10 of the first volume, when the author might be supposed to be as yet somewhat cool and mindful of the laws of physics, the guests at

* "English Men of Letters Series." Macmillan. 1880.

Zenobia's gatherings having kissed her hand, then "vanish into air." Lord Beaconsfield's novels are like Adrian Neuchatel's dinners—all banquets; and with aristocratic old Lord Montfort, the reader may feel: "I cannot stand those ortolans stuffed with truffles and those truffles stuffed with ortolans." This excess of grandeur, together with a mocking want of earnestness, spoil a book that contains not a few clever sketches drawn in clear, strong lines; much amusing satire, and here and there epigrams with not a little of the old brilliancy.

The limits of an article have been passed, and some farther remarks had been intended on the moral and the didactic tendency of the novel—for every novel, a great novelist has lately assured us, *must* teach something. But Lord Beaconsfield, it may be safely assumed, did not dream of teaching. Even the political changes of the period he covers, and the passions and interests and plots that led to them, and the men who accomplished or modified them, are not described with even the prime element of seriousness—in a tone of amused mockery that is, perhaps, natural to the retrospect of a man of his temper who is also a successful statesman. What his puppets say, if through his own mouth, is, he may urge, only what artistic feeling shows ought to be put there—the sentiments may not be his. But that his story is intended to teach that Will is irresistible, and that you have only to will determinedly and your dream of ambition is sure to be fulfilled, is plain as words can make it. But the hero and the heroine—twin brother and sister—both succeed purely and unmistakably from chance—good fortune; call it anything but wilful endeavour. If this has a farther and secret tendency it is to persuade that such golden opportunities may be counted on by others in actual life. That it would be wise to ever anticipate them would be a most pernicious lesson. But are we not too serious to philosophize thus about such an author and such a book—in which the aristocracy is "an enchanted circle;" politics the "great gain"; and ambition can hold out to man nothing higher than a place and power and wealth, and a title and a fair wife? Are there no domestic delights, is there no happiness in the pure love of children, no virtue or bravery in self-conquest, in resistance of the temptation to ascend high, or be crowned with gold, or blessed with whatever else is of earthly value if it cannot be won but by a sacrifice of principle and honour?

However it may be about moral, or tendency, or style—Lord Beaconsfield's "Endymion" will be largely read—is being everywhere read at this moment. But it is not even equal in either composition or style to his earlier novels, and it may be easily predicted that it will not live even so long as they. That he had good reasons for writing, we have been assured, and can readily believe.

If there were no better reason than this: he has always sought celebrity as an author—and another book by a famous Statesman, and a writer of very great power and ability, is sure to sell. So many people are like Berengaria, Lady Montfort: "Anybody amuses me for once," she says, "a new acquaintance is like a new book. I prefer it, even if bad, to a classic." "*Endymion*" is not a classic, and we fear can serve no further purpose than to be a new book.

ART. VIII.—JUSTICE TO IRELAND.

1. *New Views on Ireland; or, Irish Land Grievances and Remedies.* By CHARLES RUSSELL, Q.C., M.P. London & Dublin. 1880.
2. *The Parliamentary History of the Irish Land Question, from 1829 to 1869.* By R. BARRY O'BRIEN. London. 1880.
3. *The Irish Land Question: a Problem in Practical Politics.* A Letter to the Right Hon. H. C. E. CHILDERS, M.P., from GEORGE ERRINGTON, M.P. London & Dublin. 1880.
4. *Reports on the Condition of the Peasantry of the County of Mayo during the Famine Crisis of 1880.* By J. A. FOX. Dublin. 1880.
5. *Irish Distress and its Remedies.* By JAMES H. TUKE. London. 1880.
6. *The Land Question, Ireland: Notes upon the Government Valuation of Land in Ireland.* Dublin. 1880.
7. *The Land Question, Ireland: Confiscation or Contract?* Dublin. 1880.

A YEAR of exceptional distress has been succeeded in Ireland by a harvest of exceptional plenty. The potato, with unspotted tubers, has been dug from a dry and crumbling soil; and the golden grain has ripened beneath skies of unclouded blue. Within the longest memory no such reward has crowned the labours of the husbandman; but we listen in vain for the *Te Deum* of a grateful people, we watch with disappointed eyes for the signs of peace and contentment.

There is surely something wrong here. Some hidden canker eats away the joyful life of a nation; some inscrutable cause impedes the fulfilment of the blessing; some fatal barrier is placed between man and the enjoyment of the products of his toil. In Southern countries, youths and maidens, crowned with

vine-leaves, with songs and laughter, bear home the purple spoil of the vineyards; and if the vintage is more abundant than usual the air rings with one universal pæan of joy. In England the farmers, in more prosaic fashion, testify their satisfaction at the completion of their labours, and celebrate the "harvest home" with varying effusiveness. But in Ireland the crops are garnered in ominous and melancholy silence; and the profusion of Nature is unable to dissipate the habitual gloom. Poverty, discomfort, and discontent are, in a considerable part of that kingdom, the ordinary lot of the Irish farmer; and the harvest is to him, at the best, but a reprieve from starvation. We speak, of course, only of those who occupy small farms in poor districts, but these are, alas! the majority of the tenant-farmers of Ireland. It is a mistake very commonly made to write and speak of Ireland as homogeneous in misery, and requiring uniform legislative treatment throughout its entire area; whereas in reality the condition of the tenants in the east and west of the island differs fundamentally as to comfort and prosperity. We shall, later on, give extracts from the writings of able and impartial men to show how wretched is the position of the occupiers of land in Donegal, Connaught, and Kerry; but our readers can never fully realize, from words alone, the prevailing misery—the utter dejection of the people of those districts. This wretchedness is one manifestation of the Land Question.

There is another aspect in which the same question obtrudes itself on our attention. Agriculture is, in Ireland, of such paramount importance, that the all-pervading Land Question is mixed up with almost every social problem. Its connection, however, with the present disturbed state of the country is so manifest that we must either ascribe the latter to some inherent defect in the system of our Land Laws, or take refuge in the untenable hypothesis of the spontaneous wickedness of the people.

We cannot protest too loudly against the agrarian outrages which, day by day, shock all feelings of humanity, and expose the Irish nation, the naturally gentle and pious Irish people, to the cruel charge of being malignant savages of the blackest dye. It is useless to deny that such acts are daily committed; the proofs are too numerous and too well substantiated. We do not seek to extenuate them; but, accepting them as a social phenomenon, we desire to arrive at the proximate causes of their existence; and we need scarcely say that the immediate remedy—what is commonly called "coercion"—is quite consistent with the admission of grievances. The condition of the country—social, material, and moral—is such as to cause the gravest anxiety. The two classes into which society may be roughly divided stand opposite each other like armies on the verge of battle. The tenant-farmers in three

provinces have been at length awakened to a lively sense of their real or imaginary wrongs, and those who are timid or contented are dominated by the threats of their more energetic neighbours. Arms are unfortunately in the hands of many, and for no good purpose. In some cases, no doubt, the "attempts to murder" and "firing into dwelling-houses" may be merely forms of intimidation; but this, when extensively diffused, is one of the worst forms of anarchy. The band of men with blackened faces, and with rifles on their shoulders, is an ugly sight for civilization to behold. It must also raise awkward questions for statesmen to solve. Not less awkward is the problem which is presented to them in the complete paralysis of legal procedure. Whether law in Ireland is equivalent to natural justice does not at this moment concern us; but we say that very anxious questions arise from the fact that the administration of the law as it exists is laughed to scorn throughout a large area of the country. The minor courts throughout the country may be said to enjoy perennial vacation: their process does not run in the agricultural districts; no one, even when guarded by a small army of police, can serve a writ, or realize a judgment. One of the land judges in Dublin has been "warned," in no doubtful terms, for performing some routine function of his office; a judge of assize has been threatened with death if his charge in a particular case dissatisfied his anonymous correspondent. Crimes of violence, of every degree of atrocity, from wilful and deliberate murder down to the pleasantry of midnight "carding," are effected with perfect immunity from arrest. The assizes are "white-gloved," Mr. Russell says in one of his interesting letters, but it would be better for the country if they were occasionally black-capped. Mr. Boyd, Lord Mountmorres, Mr. Wheeler, and Downey, the unoffending car-driver, were all shot openly on the highway, or close to it. We can scarcely conceive it possible that these crimes can have been committed in broad daylight on the public roads without the authors being known to numbers of the inhabitants. Mr. Russell, after advert- ing to the circumstance that many crimes classed as agrarian may be ascribed to other causes, continues—

Apart from all exaggeration, however, the sad truth is that the country has been stained with several grave crimes of an agrarian character—worse still, these crimes meet with a considerable amount of sympathy among the masses. In a people not wanting in general morality these facts are the more significant.*

Blackened faces cannot be so common in Mayo, Wexford, Limerick and Cork as not to stimulate the curiosity of the peasants. A rifle is not easily concealed about the person; but we have

* "New Views on Ireland," p. 2.

never heard of anyone carrying a weapon being met near the scene of an outrage. The truth is that the peasantry, even in ordinary times, think it no business of theirs to help the law; an "informer" is to them as loathsome as a leper; and now, when any information might lead to serious personal consequences, they will go almost any length rather than denounce a murderer, or give any clue for his identification.

We are thus saved from the necessity of concluding that entire districts are privy to the actual execution of murder. To screen the man who flies red-handed from justice, is manifestly a crime of a very different complexion from that of antecedent knowledge, or actual participation. The law itself makes a great distinction between accessories before and after the fact; and the separation is still wider in morals than in law. We do not wish to be understood as palliating in any way the awful condition of a country where murder and outrage are committed with impunity; but we should be ignoring history and experience if we denied that this state of things has been mainly brought about by causes which it is the duty, as it should be the pride, of enlightened statesmen to remove. This disturbed condition of the country we may call the second manifestation of the Land Question.

Let us not be misunderstood: we find rather more than half of Ireland afflicted with two serious diseases—misery and lawlessness—the one chronic, the other epidemic; and these it is that we have described as manifestations of the Land Question; and for this reason—because we consider that the peculiar conditions of land tenure in Ireland are responsible for both. At all events, the problem before the minds of statesmen at the present moment is to determine by what alterations in the land laws they can change misery into comfort, and lawlessness into peace and contentment.

The connexion, indeed, between the agrarian outrages and the Land Question is self-evident without proof, but it may be suggested that, between the land laws as they exist and the destitution of the peasantry, the relation of cause and effect does not necessarily hold good; that in England the law is even less lenient to the tenant, and yet poverty, as understood in Ireland, is unknown; that a tenant who is unable to put a handle in his spade, or a lynch-pin in his cart, to shape a wooden platter, to mend his broken door, or drive a nail in his horse's shoe, is but poorly qualified by thrift and education to commence life as a peasant proprietor; that, in fine, to his Celtic character, his idle habits, his perverse fatalism, his incapacity for steady labour, his improvident gratification of every passion, the peasant must ascribe his indigence, rather than to the operation of the laws under which he lives. It is a sufficient answer to the persons

who advance such arguments, to point out that in America, Australia, and even in England, the Celtic character does not prohibit an advance to the highest positions; and that the Irish are in those countries anything but "idle, perverse fatalists, with an incapacity for steady labour, improvidently gratifying every passion." The obvious inference is that it is the depressing circumstances of their environment which hinders a social improvement in their native land. Give the peasant something to hope for, something to work for, and the change will come sooner or later. His present life is a continuous struggle against starvation and the workhouse. When these two enemies are worsted, his immediate object is attained; but this is not a condition in which the incitements to active exertion are keenly felt. There is a depth of misery from which people seem bereft not only of the power, but even the wish to rise. It is a delusive mockery to speak of comfort to such people as Mr. Tuke describes in the following passages:—

Patrick Burns holds four cows' grasses, pays £6 a year, and owes 9s. 6d. county cess. "Has neither cow, nor calf, nor ewe, nor lamb, nor baste that treads the earth." He owes three years' rent. His son had gone to America; he sent him the first 30s. he earned, leaving himself only two dollars. Then he sent £3, but he had not heard of him since November. He had a loom, and was sitting at it as we entered, but there was neither woof nor warp—he was only mechanically moving the frame backwards and forwards. Then he told us how, one after another, his family had died, and how he had gradually got lower and lower, and that had it not been for the meal given away he would have had nothing to eat.*

This pathetic picture of the old Donegal weaver listlessly moving the frame of his loom might almost be taken as an allegorical representation of the manufactures of Ireland. Here is one from the same district in which is nothing but the reality of agricultural misery:—

The cottages are even less suited for human habitation than those we visited yesterday at Killibegs. Four rough stone walls, often without any plaster, covered with thatch, 12ft. by 15ft. or 18ft., constitute the home of a family of five, of ten, or twelve persons. The floors are the stone of the rocky hill-side upon which the dwelling is built, and the smoke from the peat fire on the hearth, after filling the house, finds its final exit either by the door or the hole in the roof which serves for a chimney.†

Of the destitution and misery of the bog-dwellings of Meenacladdy, Mr. Tuke says he can hardly bring himself to write; but

* "Irish Distress and its Remedies," p. 12.

† Ibid. p. 14.

he compels his pen to record *seriatim* some painful examples of "the every-day life, the normal condition of hundreds, nay, thousands, of families on the west coast of Donegal." This is his account of the first of these homes:—

A turf dwelling near the road, which my friends, who were not acquainted with the West, could not believe was a human habitation. The end of the house towards the road was not more than four or five feet high, but as the ground sank rapidly on the other side you were able to find an entrance through a low doorway. Within, at first, all appeared dark, the peat smoke which filled the room blinding us. When a little accustomed to the smoke, we saw, by the light which strayed in through the opening in the roof where the smoke ought to have gone out, but did not, a woman and several children crouched around a small fire. There was neither chair, nor table in the place; probably one small stool was all they possessed in this way. The bedstead was covered with a little ragged coverlid, beneath which some straw was spread on the wooden frame; the children, or others who could not find room upon it, lay down on the bare rock or earth of the floor, in the thin clothes they wear all day, with a little hay or straw beneath them. The family had no resources left.*

The other habitations which he visited were of the same character, some a little better, some still worse—even worse than "the bog-holes of Erris" with which he was familiar in 1847. We take one more extract from his pages, which, from its mere picturesqueness, is worthy of a place. It describes the little village of Camus, in Connemara:—

I wish [he writes] I could produce that rocky coast and wild miserable village, or rather introduce it into England for a while, so that English people might realize how, in these remote places, so many thousands of people are living. Half-a-mile away, and I will venture to say no one would think it possible that any human being could live or even find foothold on the rock-strewn shore; but by degrees you see the little "smokes" arising, and here and there little dark strips of land, which show that the ground is being prepared for the potatoes they *hope* to obtain, for they have none left to plant. Then you see peering above the rocks little dark heads of men, women, and children, who, attracted by the unusual sight, come out of their cabins to reconnoitre. As you walk among them on landing, they watch you with curious eyes: they do not beg, and cannot answer your inquiries, for most do not understand, and few can talk, English. They are a race of wild people, poorly clad, and living with the cattle in their houses, often lying on the damp ground on hay like them.†

These were strange sights for an English gentleman to behold, accustomed as he was to the comparative luxury of the agricultural

* Ibid. p. 26.

† Ibid. p. 76.

classes in his own country; and lest it should be imagined that his descriptions were involuntarily coloured by the shock of contrast, we call on Mr. Fox to corroborate his testimony. Mr. Fox was employed as travelling inspector in the county of Mayo by the Mansion House Committee, and the Reports which stand at the head of this article were presented to that body, as the results of his labours.

I do not believe [he writes] that tongue or pen, however eloquent, could truly depict the awful destitution of some of these hovels. The children are often nearly naked. Bedding there is none, everything of that kind having long since gone to the pawn-office. A layer of old straw covered by the dirty sacks which conveyed the seed potatoes and artificial manure in the spring is the sole provision of thousands—with this exception, that little babies in wooden boxes are occasionally indulged with a bit of thin old flannel stitched on to the sacking. Sometimes even charity itself had failed, and the mother of the tender young family was found absent, begging for the loan of some Indian meal from other recipients of charitable relief.*

We might multiply instances of a similar kind almost *ad infinitum*, but our readers will be satisfied by what we have already stated that in the west of Ireland a state of depression has become chronic which has scarcely a parallel in the civilized world. The agricultural labourer in England had not some years ago, an enviable lot; and, even at the present day, he cannot be said to have risen much above the lowest grade of cultivated humanity; but, compared with the Irish tenant-farmers whom we have been attempting to describe, his cottage is a palace, and his fare a sumptuous banquet. The contrast is easily understood when we remember that the English labourer receives wages varying from 12s. to 18s. per week; and, if fortunate in obtaining employment, his annual revenue will not be less than £20 or £30. Now it is clearly impossible that farms of three to five acres of Connaught bog-land can provide produce equivalent in value even to these miserable stipends. The valuation of some holdings in Gweedore is as low as 2s. 6d., from which the sum of 1½d. is annually collected for county cess; and many occupiers pay from 3d. to 6d. In Connaught, before the famine, two-thirds of all the holdings were less than five acres; and at the present time, though the proportion is enormously diminished, there are still more than 20,000 such miserable farms.

No one can doubt [says Mr. Tuke] that the minute sub-division of land, *with no other source of income* to the holder of the small plots, is one of the great evils which surround the Land Question. And in

* Reports, p. 11.

connection with this part of the subject it is of *the utmost importance to realize the fact that farms under ten, fifteen, or twenty acres of land, according to its quality, are too small to support a family.* It matters not whether a man has fixity of tenure, or being a peasant proprietor has no rent to pay, he cannot, unless he has some other source of income, live and bring up a family on the small farms under ten or fifteen acres of land which form so large a proportion of the holdings in the west of Ireland.*

This is a point of cardinal importance, and should not be lost sight of in any legislative attempt to settle the Land Question. Quite irrespective of rent, the occupier cannot support life on the produce of a small farm of poor land. And if we consider the amount of capital and labour employed in its cultivation, we shall not be surprised at this result. The inevitable truth stares us in the face that income, or the means of sustaining life from year to year, must result either from interest on capital, or from wages for labour. The agriculturist cannot expect to obtain an extraordinary rate of interest, or wages for his personal labour out of proportion to the nature of his work; because if these exceptional advantages were to be gained in farming, capital or labour would be attracted to that pursuit until equilibrium should be restored. If a farmer by working fifty or sixty days in the year obtained as comfortable a subsistence as a mason or carpenter whose trade occupied the whole of his time, who would be a carpenter or mason?

The capital employed in farming the class of holdings of which we are now speaking may be almost entirely ignored: a cow, a small horse or donkey, some fowls, and a few rough utensils, too often represent the whole worldly possession of the occupying tenant. If we add the value of such permanent improvements, buildings, fences, roads and drains, as may have been effected by his labour, or that of his predecessors, the total capital is still represented by a very insignificant figure. There remains the labour of husbandry. How many days' work is actually devoted to the cultivation of the soil, and gathering the harvest? And what is the ordinary rate of wages for the day labourer? From these two factors we can with certainty deduce the economic position of the tenant farmer. The result is not encouraging. In the smallest holdings, which are tilled by the occupier and his family without the help of hired labourers, sixty days probably suffice for all the simple operations of preparing the ground, drawing sea-weed or sand, planting, sowing, digging and reaping. Now, allowing two shillings a day to the farmer for his work, his sixty days are worth in the labour-market only £6 in

* "Irish Distress and its Remedies," p. 91.

the year, a sum manifestly insufficient to supply even one man with the coarsest food. The same result might be obtained by deducting from the value of the gross produce of such a farm the actual expenses of production. There would remain a ridiculously small sum to represent the intrinsic value of the farm. Yet thousands of families attempt the battle of life under these conditions. It might be called the economic paradox of Connaught; and its explanation is, that the inhabitants eke out the insufficient produce of their farms by labouring in the harvest fields of England and Scotland. Were it not for these annual migrations, the paradox would meet with a speedy and disastrous explanation. In the districts of Kerry visited by Mr. Russell, this source of income is precluded by their remoteness; and, though the people are as poor as can well be imagined, yet subdivision of the soil is not carried to so dangerous an extent as in Connaught. Before the depopulation of this county, however, by the great famine, the farms of some tenants were so miserably inadequate for their support, that, after digging their potatoes, many of them used to nail up the doors of their hovels, and traverse the country begging from house to house. To such an extent did this prevail half a century ago, that the poor creatures came to be known far and wide as "Lord Lansdowne's Kerry beggars." We shall presently explain the position of the Irish tenant as defined by law; but, before doing so, it will be as well to glance at the relations between him and his landlord. Every social problem is an organic growth; and, as the scarred bark of the sapling is visible for centuries in the forest tree, so the injustice of the past leaves its mark upon subsequent generations in a manner very perplexing and provoking to practical legislators. On the harmony of classes almost everything depends in the legislative adjustment of their rights; but we cannot by law blot out, on the one hand, the memory of past wrongs; or mitigate, on the other, the irritation which is felt at the infringement of established privileges. We cannot, therefore, ignore the past, since it is the explanation of the present; although we feel disappointment that extensive concessions to the tenant have not effected that improvement in his position which might have been anticipated; a circumstance to be explained in part by the fact that the goodwill of the landlords was alienated by the attempt to define by law the limits of their power.

In the "old times," in spite of confiscations, penal laws, payment of tithes and religious intolerance, the landlord and tenant were sometimes on comparatively friendly terms. The former was possibly an easy-going, good-natured man, with a large disorderly house, where every tenant occasionally tasted the overflowing hospitality of the kitchen; not over anxious about a gale

or two of rent, and ever ready to lend a sympathizing ear to the trials and troubles of his people; above all, he could speak to them in their own tongue, his ways were their ways, and they regarded him with a rapidly growing feeling of clanship. But, in too many cases, the tenant felt himself in the iron grasp of a social despotism. If the landlord was oppressive, he had no redress; he was as helpless as a Kentucky slave, or Russian serf. There was not in those days a system of poor law, to which, in the last resort, the miserable evicted tenant could turn for support; there was no public opinion to restrain the arbitrary exactions of local tyrants; there was no moral or political influence which could be brought to bear on the bad landlord to induce him to stay his hand; and, in one word, the majority lived by the sufferance of the minority. Such a state of society is simply intolerable. Several circumstances about the beginning of this century tended to intensify the evil. Until the Reform Bill the franchise was limited to forty-shilling freeholders; and, in order to increase their political influence, the landlords manufactured votes by the creation of multitudes of these petty holdings. The population also, at this time, rapidly increased; and, as there was no outlet in trade or industry, the people were thrown on the land which they were content to occupy on any terms that were offered to them. The middlemen did not feel for their tenants the sympathy inspired by feudal dependence. They were themselves tenants, and had to pay their head-rents with punctuality and exactness. Why should they not enforce to the letter the obligations of their tenants? Land, too, from the high prices that prevailed during the French war, had acquired a factitious value; and leases were then made at rents which, on the subsequent fall of prices, it was impossible to pay. The result was that the occupier became more and more a creature dependent on the will of his lord. A system is not to be judged by its best, but by its worst results. On many a Southern plantation the negroes were happier than they would ever have been on the banks of their native Gambia, far happier than the landlord-ridden Irish serf; but these isolated cases only compel us to admire the self-denial of the individual slave-owner, they do not palliate the evils of the institution. And the position of the Irish tenant *was* very closely akin to slavery. True, his master could not sell his body, but his dominion only just stopped short of that. The power of life and death was implicitly contained in the power of eviction; and the rights of property were practically annihilated by the unlimited prerogative of raising the rent. It is no exaggeration to say, that, from the landlord's point of view, the sole right of the tenant was to live—and even this was an amiable concession—to live in the poorest fashion, ill-fed, roughly-clad,

and with no break in the monotony of his miserable life. The entire produce of the soil, after furnishing the occupier with the very minimum of subsistence, was regarded as the legitimate revenue of the landlord. From this source have sprung the proverbial apathy and suspiciousness of the Irish tenants. What use in improving if an increased rent is the penalty of exertion and outlay? And where is the premium on thrift, if hard-earned savings are to be appropriated by the rapacious greed of a landlord? Not alone were permanent improvements in the farm made the occasion of "a rise in the rent;" but even if the cottage assumed an air of neatness or cleanliness, if the farmer's wife was seen with a new cloak, or his own toilet gave evidence of increased prosperity, the lynx-eyed bailiff would take a mental note that this was a man who would bear the screw. Can we wonder then at slovenly farming, dirty hovels, half-naked children, and reckless habits, when we find that for generations everything has been done to check industry and foster suspicion? A far-seeing, intelligent landlord would, no doubt, be delighted that his tenant should have a substantial balance at the bank; but, in Ireland, if such a discovery had been made, it would, in most cases, have given rise to an outburst of indignation on the part of the landlord, as unaffected as if the lodgment had been made with notes stolen from himself. Thence the stocking and the thatch became the hiding-place of the tenant's hoard; and, instead of fructifying one hundred fold in the soil, it very often became the prey of fire or pillage. From this mode of treatment the Irish (as wild animals learn the fear of man) acquired a deep-seated suspiciousness, which must now be regarded as having taken a permanent place in the national character. At the time of the famine the people of Erris would not accept as a gift the seed which was offered to them for the purpose of sowing their land, fearing lest it was a *ruse* on the part of the landlords to acquire a right to the crops. At the same terrible epoch, it was with the greatest difficulty that the starving population of Mayo were induced to eat the Indian meal—Peel's brimstone, as they called it—being persuaded that it was given to them with the sinister design of turning them black! These instances speak for themselves, and illustrate the condition of mind to which these poor creatures were reduced by harsh treatment and habitual exactions. Everyone acquainted with the Irish peasantry can recall many similar examples of distrust—all, we assert, to be explained by the insecurity of the tenant's position, and the necessity which he was under of habitual concealment.

The famine of 1846-7 was a blow of stunning violence, not only to landlord and tenant, but to every branch of industry throughout the country. The small farmers died or emigrated

in great numbers, leaving thereby more room for the survivors, and their position would, after some years, have been actually ameliorated, had it not been for the influence brought to bear on them by the misfortunes of their hereditary masters. The tenants had starved, the landlords had only been ruined; but the ruin was, in many cases, complete and irredeemable. With a flourish of trumpets the Encumbered Estates Act was passed to help the insolvent owner to pay his debts, and to attract capital to the land. The capital came freely enough, the ancient possessors were got rid of, and vast areas of the country passed through the Court; but the large estates were broken up, the hereditary owners, who had some of the bowels of compassion for the people, gradually disappeared, and were replaced by purchasers whose sole object was to make the best of their bargains. The introduction of the commercial spirit was fatal to the hope of friendly relations. The new men had paid their money and required their rent, which was to them in no respect different from the interest on any other form of investment. From this epoch may be dated the breaking out of the land-war, which has ever since continued to afflict the country. Evictions were succeeded by assassinations, estates were "cleared," and multitudes of angry emigrants left the shores of Ireland to found in America a republic of disaffection. What may be the troubles of England in the future from this trans-atlantic Ireland we cannot now forecast. We only know that already it has ripened several troublesome but impotent insurrections, and has tended to alienate more and more the sympathies of Irishmen from the Imperial Crown. Never, perhaps, were the conditions of agrarian life less harmonious than in the twenty years preceding Mr. Gladstone's Act of 1870, if we except the ten years since it was passed. Conciliation and coercion were tried alternately and simultaneously, but with little effect; and branch after branch of the famous upas-tree was lopped off, only to prove its indefinite power of putting forth new shoots. Our readers, we hope, now clearly understand from the foregoing remarks that, whatever may be the legal rights of the parties, the Irish tenants in certain districts are intensely miserable, and that their social relations towards their landlords have been, for a number of years, of the most acrimonious character. We now pass to a brief review of the efforts that have been made to remedy this lamentable condition.*

* It is hardly necessary, here, to allude to the theological principles of the Church in regard to the payment of rent. In the eye of the Church, the taking of a farm is a species of contract, and the taker is bound in justice to pay the stipulated rent at the due time. A flagrantly unjust contract is no contract at all; but it would require the rent to be very much more than the proper value to justify a tenant in repudiating his

Mr. O'Brien, in the book whose title we have placed at the head of this article, traces in considerable detail the history of the Irish Land Question, or more properly the history of tenant-right, from Catholic Emancipation down to the year 1869. It is a sufficiently dreary record of famines and select committees, abortive bills, debates on the state of Ireland, and harrowing reports on the misery of the tenants, much defensive energy on the part of the landlords, and concessions doled out too late to win the gratitude, or secure the loyalty of the people.

The question of tenant-right, or compensation for improvements, may be said to have originated with Mr. Sharman Crawford's Bill in 1835; and, through a long parliamentary career, he never ceased to struggle for this beneficent object. Lord Stanley, the late Lord Derby, when Chief Secretary for Ireland under Sir Robert Peel in 1845, introduced a measure providing for the compensation of tenants on eviction; but it was limited to future improvements, and required the intervention of a Commissioner. Narrow as was its operation, the House of Commons could not swallow it, even as a Government Bill, and it was accordingly dropped. Successive Chief Secretaries under subsequent Governments, both Whig and Tory, fathered Bills on the same general lines, with slight modifications in the machinery; and Mr. Sharman Crawford as an independent member returned again and again to the charge. None of these bills met with any success. Some were referred to select committees, some were lost by changes of Government, many were thrown out by the division on second reading. The subject entered on a new phase in 1852. The country was stirred. "An agitation vigorous and wide-spread was now raised in the interests of the tenant-farmers throughout Ireland,"* and, as the ordinary accompaniment of agrarian excitement, outrages and disturbances ensued. Sir George Grey, on behalf of the Liberal Government, speaking on what had become almost the Annual Tenant-right Bill, threatened the "strong arm" of

contract on that ground; and to act on a merely personal judgment in such a matter would be dangerous and generally sinful. It was a principle of the Canon Law, grounded chiefly on a declaration of Gregory IX. in the case of Church lands, that when the harvest wholly failed no rent need be paid by the tenant, and when the harvest partially failed some deduction was to be made. But the civil law of each particular country, as St. Alphonsus and Kenrick clearly lay down (St. Alph. Theol. Moral. Lib. iv., Tract 5, n. 860; Kenrick, Tract 11, n. 43), is now the rule in all such matters; and the law of England, like the law of the United States (differing in this respect from the *Code Napoleon*, Art. 1769-1770), hold the tenant a debtor for the whole rent, whatever may be the results of his own labours or the badness of the season.

* "Parliamentary History of the Land Question," p. 88.

coercion; while Mr. Bright, in the same debate, gave expression to principles such as he still advocates. He said:—

It was in the eternal decrees of Providence that so long as the population of a country were prevented from the possibility of possessing any portion of their native soil by legal enactments and legal chicanery, these outrages should be committed, were they but as beacons and warnings to call the Legislature to a sense of the duties it owed to the country which it governed.*

Towards the close of the year, Mr. Napier, the Conservative Attorney-General for Ireland, brought in a bill recognizing for the first time the tenant's right to compensation for *past* improvements. This was a great stride towards the settlement of a vexed question; and, if it had become law at that time, the history of Ireland might have been different from what it has been. "Napier's Code," however, although passed in the Commons was mutilated in the House of Lords by the rejection of the Tenants' Compensation Bill, and in this imperfect state was sent back to the Lower House. A change of ministry prevented any further step being taken in the prosecution of the measure. The agitation, too, degenerated into agrarian crime; and the leaders of the Irish Parliamentary party were so far forgetful of their hustings' pledges as to accept various offices under the Government. The disruption of the "brass band" discredited for a time the sincerity of Irish members; and the "Independent Opposition," as the patriotic party subsequently styled themselves, found it difficult to establish their political probity, and always laboured, unjustly we believe, under a suspicion of being "place-hunters," which diminished their popularity throughout the country. They continued, however, to bring forward every session a tenant-right measure which uniformly met with an untimely fate. At length, in 1860, the Government of Lord Palmerston introduced and passed a Bill to amend the law relating to the Tenure and Improvement of Land, including among other provisions a qualified measure of tenant-right. It was limited to future improvements made by the tenant with the consent of the landlord, or without such consent upon compliance with certain conditions, service of notices on the landlord and the like, which no Irish tenant was man enough to perform; and which were possibly introduced for the express purpose of rendering the Act inoperative.

"If the Act of 1860, says Mr. Finlason, had been *successful*, it would have destroyed any claim of the tenant even to compensation for *future* improvements, unless in accordance with some *contract* express or implied."†

* "Hansard," 3rd Series, cxix. p. 368.

† "Parliamentary History of the Land Question," p. 113.

After a quarter-century of unceasing struggle this abortive measure was all that could be wrung from an unwilling Parliament of landlords. Coupled with this Act was another, which now stands next to it on the Statute Book, "*An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Law of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland*,"* which repealed all the previous statutes on the subject, furnished a complete code in their stead, and introduced several changes of an important nature. As the legal position of the tenant in Ireland is still to a great extent governed by this Act, we must briefly refer to some of its provisions. It starts by sweeping away the feudal doctrines of tenure and service, and substituting for them the simple law of express or implied contract. It empowered the tenant to remove all fixtures attached by him to the freehold at his sole expense, to cut turf from unreclaimed bog for himself and his under-tenants, and limited distress to rent which had accrued within a year. But these advantages were more than counterbalanced by the fearfully simple code of ejectment which it supplied. In fact, it might have been appropriately entitled, "*An Act to Facilitate Evictions in Ireland*." That, indeed, was the merciful intention of its promoters. The Attorney-General for Ireland, in introducing the measure, said:—

The law ought not to be left in such a state as to afford the tenant a continual temptation, instead of paying his rent, to spend his money in litigation with his landlord, and to waste among the attorneys those funds which might be better employed in stocking a new farm. With this view, to render the law more plain and the remedies for any infringement of it efficacious and inexpensive, the Bill had been very carefully prepared.†

If a tenant had to go, it was better that he should be disposed of quickly and cheaply. Let us at all events, they urged, have a simple law that can be understood by the unlearned, and applied with swift, unerring justice. It is a cruel kindness to enable a tenant to postpone eviction by legal quibbles, which can only result in eventually saddling him with an intolerable burthen of costs. This was the line taken by the advocates of cheap and expeditious eviction; but it might as well be argued that it is for a man's advantage to be hanged at the expense of the State, because he saved thereby the cost of a funeral. Land in Ireland is life; and, reasonable as it may appear that, when a man cannot pay his rent, he should give up his farm, yet this view does not commend itself to the Irish tenant.

The common law abhors forfeitures; and accordingly conditions

* 23 and 24 Vict. c. 154.

† "*Hansard*," 3rd Series, clix. p. 2154.

of re-entry, which are essentially forfeitures, have always been construed with the utmost strictness against the lessor. The consequence was that ejectment for non-payment of rent, according to the common law, was of little use, and but rarely resorted to. Moreover, it did not apply at all unless by the express contract of the parties. Landlord legislators had by a number of Acts, commencing in the reign of Anne, endeavoured to remedy in their own interest the inconvenient mercy of the common law; but until "Deasy's Act" was passed ejectment for non-payment of rent could not have been brought against a tenant from year to year. And in England that is still the law. In Ireland, on the contrary, the moment that a year's rent is due, the landlord can commence proceedings, in the County Court if the rent is under £100, and in the Superior Courts whatever the rent may be. By way of softening the asperity of this law, the tenant is allowed six months after the execution of the *Habere*, or Civil Bill Decree, as the writs of possession are called, to redeem his holding by payment of arrears of rent, interest and costs; and, on so redeeming he can compel his landlord to account to him for the profits of the farm. In order to avoid this complication it commonly occurs that the dispossessed tenant is allowed to return into possession as a paid "care-taker:" or upon the terms of signing an "acknowledgment" of the landlord's title in a form supplied by the Act. In either event, the tenant is, at the expiration of the six months, completely at the mercy of his landlord. And yet in "Confiscation or Contract?" the provisions of this Act are enumerated among the conditions favourable to the tenant! "Such are the benefits," exclaims the author of this pamphlet, glowing with the indiscriminating zeal of a recent convert—"such are the benefits conferred upon the tenant by the Landlord and Tenant Act of 1860!" If the position of the tenant depended on this Act alone, there would be indeed an overwhelming case for instant and energetic reform; in fact, such a case as enabled Mr. Gladstone in 1870 to force through Parliament, and down the very throats of reluctant peers, an Act which violated every ancestral prejudice as to the tenure of land. Why then did it fail, as it assuredly has failed, to satisfy the cravings of the Irish people? This is the Land Question whose two-fold manifestations we have already spoken of as "misery" and "lawlessness." It is too much the practice of speakers and writers on this subject to ignore altogether the Land Act of 1870, and go behind it for thrilling tales of eviction. It would be wiser to recognize the fact that since 1870 capricious evictions have practically ceased in Ireland, that a great measure of tenant-right was conceded in that year, but that somehow there still remains something to be done to render the Irish tenant prosperous and contented.

We shall sketch as briefly as possible the tenant-right provisions of the Act; and our readers who are familiar with the less indulgent law of England, will be tempted to exclaim, "What more do they want?" It will subsequently be our duty to endeavour to answer that question.

The maxim, *quicquid plantatur solo, solo cedit*, was by this Act utterly blown to the winds. The owner of the freehold was deprived of the power, which he had before, of seizing, without payment, the buildings and other improvements on his land, to the making of which he had in no way contributed. Any contract whereby the tenant bound himself not to make suitable improvements, or to relinquish his claim to compensation, was declared to be void; and the presumption of law was shifted, so as to put the landlord to the proof, that improvements on any holding had *not* been made by the tenant or his predecessors. This compensation was made payable on any determination of the tenancy, whether the tenant was evicted for non-payment of rent, or voluntarily abandoned his holding; but the other kind of compensation then introduced was made to depend on disturbance of the tenant by the act of the landlord—that is to say, on "capricious" eviction; and it was not extended to cases where the tenant was evicted for non-payment of rent, or for the breach of any condition against assignment, sub-letting, bankruptcy, or insolvency. As in the case of compensation for improvements, any contract by the tenant to forego his claims was made null and void. A scale of compensation was supplied by the Act, proceeding on the general principle, that the smaller the holding the greater should be the proportion of compensation to rent. Thus, a tenant whose farm is valued at £10, or under, may get a sum equal to seven, while a £100 valuation corresponds to but one year's rent.

These are, in outline, the two tenant-rights conferred by the Land Act—compensation in all cases for improvements, compensation in case of capricious eviction for disturbance. But it will be noticed that no property is expressly transferred from the landlord to the tenant; and on this ground the supporters of the Bill were accustomed to repel the charge of "confiscation." We consider the argument sophistical and untenable. The more logical position is to admit that valuable rights were conferred on the tenant, but that this transfer was justified by natural equity, and rendered expedient by the peculiar social conditions of the country. It is indisputable that the man who bought land in 1869 paid for something which he could not sell in 1870; and, so far, there was an apparent confiscation. But is that worse than that the landlord should acquire by eviction in 1869 what the tenant had for twenty years been creating by his industry and

outlay? There was a choice of evils, and we believe the lesser was chosen. Assuming that there was what amounted to a legislative transfer of property from landlord to tenant, still that would be not only expedient, but also just, if it could be shown that thereby social changes were effected, which would increase the value of property to such an extent as to fully recoup the landlord for his loss by "confiscation." Tenant-right has been epigrammatically defined as landlord-wrong. This, like most flippant catchwords on great subjects, is only superficially true. It assumes that everything given to the tenant is taken from the landlord, and it implies that such a transfer is always contrary to natural justice. It is plain that if we declare by law the occupier to be joint owner with the present landlord, in the proportion, say, of one to four, we confer thereby a valuable property on the tenant at the expense of the landlord; but if the result of the measure is, by establishing social peace, to raise the value of land from twenty to thirty years' purchase, the landlord will be eventually benefited to the extent of two and a half years' purchase.

We have now traced the gradual improvement in the legal position of the tenant from one of complete dependence to what, in a healthy state of society, would be one of ample security. But, unfortunately, the Irish tenant is not a free agent, he does not contract on equal terms with the owner of land; the competition for land is so great that he cannot be trusted to stand out in an open market for a fair bargain. We have seen how the Land Act protected him against his improvident contracts, by a legislative declaration of his imbecility; it virtually classes him with infants, idiots, and married women, as a person incapable of entering into a binding arrangement as to certain matters. This points out pretty clearly the weak link in the chain. If he is unable to contract as to improvements, how can it be expected that he will be *compos mentis* as to rent? In his hunger for land, will he not agree to pay an impossible rent, will he not submit to periodic exaction? This is, we fear, what actually occurs. Mr. Russell, in the letters from which we have already made quotations, exposes several devices for "screwing up" the rent. The "silent system," the charge for lime, the drainage loans, and the "hanging gales" are all transactions which would be repudiated with scorn by the tenant if there were anything approaching to perfect freedom of contract. No doubt the manly and straightforward position for a tenant to assume, when told that his rent was to be raised five shillings an acre, would be to decline to pay it if excessive, permit the extortionate landlord to bring ejection, and claim compensation for disturbance in his former holding. The dread of eviction is too great, the love of his farm too strong, to permit him to take this course, and he accordingly submits to

his impossible rent, enters on a new tenancy, and loses his claim for compensation.

This practical inability to resist the imposition of an increased rent is the weak point in the present position of the tenant; and it is due, not so much to any deficiency in the existing law, as to the immoderate competition for land which regulates the market price of that commodity in the Irish market.

We shall presently notice some of the most prominent schemes which have been propounded for the settlement of this difficult question; but we must now advert to the painful topic of the social disorganization that prevails in Ireland, the causes that have produced it, and the measures that may be, or should have been taken, to repress it. There is no country in the world—even at the present moment—where a stranger's life and property are so safe as in Ireland. The English tourist may traverse the wildest districts of Connemara, and trust himself alone with the half-starved population of Erris, or Achill, with the same confidence that the heroine of Moore's ballad reposed in her countrymen. Yet, the record of crimes of violence for this year, when it is published, will be a black page in the "criminal statistics." No complete returns for the year 1880 are as yet available, but from the recent Blue Book* we learn that between the 1st January, 1879, and the 31st January, 1880, a period of thirteen months, the total number of agrarian outrages which had been reported to the constabulary in Ireland was 977, more than half of which were perpetrated in the last four months of the term comprised in the return. Only sixty-nine, or seven per cent. of the whole, were followed by convictions; while in sixty-five the offenders were made amenable, but not convicted. Ten murders, for which but one man suffered the extreme penalty; seven cases of "firing at the person;" seventeen assaults endangering life, and twenty-seven outrages on cattle, constitute the most heinous of these agrarian crimes; the large majority being cases of intimidation by letters, notices, or nocturnal visits of armed bands; 605 persons reported such occurrences to the police, and, although in some instances the warnings or threats were disregarded with impunity, yet we find that Lord Mountmorres, on the 13th November, 1879, received a letter "threatening him with Lord Leitrim's death if he did not deal properly with his poor tenants." We know how well this pledge was redeemed! Another remarkable case is mentioned of a notice posted on the 19th November, warning the people not to pay any dues to the Rev. D. Mylott, P.P. "because he would not forward rent-agitation meetings." Among the long list of threatened persons we find the names of

* Agrarian Crime (Ireland). 1880. Return No. 131.

such popular men as Sir A. Guinness (Lord Ardilaun), the Knight of Glin, and Colonel King-Harman; and even the "Nun of Kenmare," that benefactress of the people of Kerry, has been subjected to a similar annoyance. A further return gives the number of outrages of the same kind, in the counties of Galway, Mayo, Sligo, and Donegal, for the five months from the 1st February to the 30th June, 1880; and we regret to notice that, as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year, there has been a marked increase of crime in all these counties except Donegal. Thus, in Galway the total number of agrarian outrages rose from forty-four to ninety-five; in Mayo from fifty-one to sixty-six; and in Sligo from nine to twenty-three; while in Donegal it diminished from thirteen to three. These figures show that in the four counties there was in the space of one year an increase of thirty-seven per cent.; the actual numbers being 137 in 1879, and 187 in 1880.

Mr. Justice Fitzgerald's charge to the Grand Jury of the associated counties of Clare, Limerick, Kerry, and Cork, delivered on the 9th December, gives a deplorable account of that extensive district.* After alluding to the comparative absence of crime at the Summer Assizes, he continued:—

But at the return from the summer vacation at the end of October last we found all changed. We found that some organization—I do not profess to say or know what it was, but some organization acting on the cupidity, the passions, and the fears of the people—had reduced some districts in the country to anarchy and confusion, little, if at all, differing from civil war.

He then analyzed the "reliable official documents" which supplied him with his facts, showing that in these four counties, within four months, a complete system of terrorism had sprung up. Two murders, 287 letters threatening murder expressly or impliedly, thirty-three cases of brutal outrages on cattle, besides malicious burnings, attacks on dwelling-houses, and nocturnal visits for purposes of intimidation, point distinctly to a temporary suspension of civilization.

In several districts [he said] embracing a large part of Munster, true liberty has ceased to exist, and intolerable tyranny prevails. Life is not secure, right is disregarded, the process of the law cannot be enforced, and dishonesty and lawlessness disgrace the land.

We fear that, when the Returns are presented for the latter half of 1880, a terrible array of crime will present itself. Day by

* Baron Dowse, at Galway, had a still more terrible narrative to relate to the grand jury of Connaught, and the judges in Leinster and Ulster had also to complain of an exceptional amount of crime, and an almost total absence of prisoners.

day the columns of the newspapers are filled with reports of outrages on men and cattle, and, though some of these have been magnified or invented by sensational "correspondents," a formidable list of well-authenticated crimes remains to attest the deplorable condition of the country. Moreover, the actual record of crime does not fully indicate the anarchy that prevails. The ordinary tribunals are powerless to enforce their decrees; an army of police, such as exists in no other country, is unable to serve a writ, or enforce obedience to the law; many men hitherto popular and beloved, are guarded night and day by armed attendants, or carry their lives in their hands, or fly from the country in terror and disgust. To disobey the mandate, or infringe the rules of an irresponsible association brings swift and terrible punishment. Intimidation, open and unchecked, is employed to paralyze the dealings of man and man; and anyone who is hardy enough to assert his rights is subjected to vehement persecution.

The system of "isolation," as a means of compelling obedience to the will of a self-constituted authority, is a new and remarkably powerful engine of democratic despotism. If an individual offends in any particular, his servants and labourers are compelled to leave their employment, the shopkeepers dare not serve him, his farm produce finds no purchaser, his land is untilled, his crops ungathered. He is shunned even by those who secretly wish him well. He is excommunicated from the fellowship of men, and he has eventually no choice but submission or ruin.

In one notorious instance the policy of isolation was counteracted by the importation of labour, but it was only for the moment, and anarchy secured the eventual victory. A battalion of infantry and a regiment of horse, besides police and artillery, protected the harvest-home at Lough Mask. The Orangemen of Monaghan and Cavan saved the proscribed crops at the cost of a hundred times their value; but the "invasion of Mayo" was necessarily but a temporary occupation, and the obnoxious owner had to accompany the retreat of the expedition.

The social revolution which is in progress in Ireland is closely connected with the organized action of the Land League. We must speak on this subject with the most guarded caution, and refrain from ascribing to that body any participation in the illegal developments of its policy; for its more prominent members now stand on their trial for seditious conspiracy in connexion with these matters, and we naturally desire to avoid in any way prejudging the question of their responsibility. It would, however, be impossible, in any review of the present state of Ireland, altogether to ignore the action of this powerful association, and we shall therefore state the objects and principles of the Land League in the words of its apologist, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., himself

to a dominant class; and the very fact of its existence acts in an unfavourable manner on the energies of the tenant. Various devices to give him absolute security have been put forward by sober-minded men, as well as enthusiasts, by persons possessed of all the knowledge attainable on the subject, and by others inconceivably ignorant; and it is generally true, here as elsewhere, that the wisdom of the scheme is fairly measured by the diffidence of the theorist. All the plans which have been proposed are broadly divisible into two classes; those that involve the expropriation of the landlords, and those that seek to amend the present relations of landlord and tenant. The former, as a wholesale measure, does not seem to be feasible; whether we propose to buy out the landlords at once by raising a stupendous loan, or give them, as Mr. Parnell has suggested, thirty-five years' rent at Griffiths' valuation, and then compel them to—make other arrangements. Colonel Gordon recommends that the west of Ireland should be purchased by the State, which would then with a light heart undertake the duties of a Connaught landlord! In none of these expropriation schemes have we noticed any provision for the difficulty (which applies with equal force to the creation of peasant proprietors) that the money-lender, or even the late landlord might buy out any number of tenants, and relet the land to them; in which case the net result of the scheme would be to substitute for the present owners, the middlemen of the Crown. These wholesale and compulsory expropriations, with or without compensation, differ essentially from the moderate plans for the promotion of peasant proprietorship, of which Mr. Bright has always been so strenuous an advocate. He would assist the occupying tenant by a State loan of three-fourths of his purchase-money, to buy up the fee-simple of his holding whenever an opportunity might arise; the loan to be repaid, both principal and interest, by instalments extending over a number of years; and, for the purpose of facilitating these purchases, he would establish a Land Commission with large powers of buying estates and re-selling them in suitable lots to the occupying tenants. That his views are wholly opposed to violent schemes of expropriation, appears from the following extract from his speech at Birmingham in November last:—

I do not now refer to some of the remedies which you have heard of—violent and impossible schemes—where tenants, apparently, are to fix their own rents, under which the landlords as a body are to be got rid of and banished, or where the Government is to undertake some gigantic transaction, raising two or three hundreds of millions of money to buy them out of their estates, and to convey the estates over to the tenants who now cultivate them. Now, I believe that the

extravagant, and the impossible, and the unjust, are not required, even in a case so serious—it may be, so desperate—as this. Those propositions which no Government can listen to, which no people can submit to—those propositions, depend upon it, are made by men who in their hearts hate much more than they love the farmers of their own country.*

The spread of peasant proprietorship under Mr. Bright's plan would be necessarily slow, and it may be doubted whether it would ever reach the class most in need of protection and reform. It leaves, therefore, something to be desired as an amendment of the general tenure of Irish tenants; and the proposals which seem to find most favour are those commonly denominated "the three F's,"—Fixity of Tenure, Fair Rents, and Free Sale. At an important meeting of the Bishop and clergy of Cloyne, a series of resolutions was proposed by the Bishop and unanimously adopted by the clergy as a guide to their future conduct, and to save individual priests from the responsibility of isolated action. These resolutions embodied, as the three cardinal points, "the three F's," and supplemented them by declarations in favour of (1) additional facilities for the tenants to become proprietors; (2) the reclamation of waste lands for the purpose of locating peasant proprietors upon them; (3) dwellings for labourers, with a moderate portion of land attached; and the last was in the following terms:—

We, the priests of Cloyne, assembled in diocesan meeting, pledge ourselves to use every effort to have the foregoing resolutions embodied in any legislation that may be proposed for the settlement of the Land Question, and to co-operate to the full extent of these resolutions, but no further, with any organized body that has for its aim such effective settlement by legitimate and constitutional action.†

The real difficulty of the scheme lies in the ascertainment of a "fair" rent. Fixity the Irish tenant already practically possesses,‡ and free sale follows almost as a matter of course from the other two. But "fair" rent opens up a vista of interminable troubles. "The value of land" is an expression of some ambiguity. It means properly the price (using for convenience money as a standard of exchanges) to be paid for the fee-simple in possession; but it is more commonly confined to an annual return, or the value of the income derived from land. This material value is strictly the difference between the value of the produce and the cost of production, including of course in the latter the

* *The Times*, November 17, 1880.

† *Freeman's Journal*, September 30, 1880.

‡ Mr. Russell writes in the *Daily Telegraph* of December 4, 1880, "Practically, fixity they have, on by far the greater number of Irish estates, but without the sense of security that ought to accompany it." A statement, however, which he somewhat modifies in the reprint of his Letters (see "New Views on Ireland," p. 107).

wages of labour, and all outgoings like rates and taxes. The "letting value" is the sense in which we are principally interested, for it is equivalent to a "fair rent," and it means "the rent that a solvent tenant will be ready to offer for the farm on a lease of moderate duration."* This is less than the intrinsic value, by the amount of the remuneration which the tenant should receive for his labour. If the farm is very small he takes the place of a single labourer employed only for a limited number of days in the year; if it amounts to 50 or 100 acres, he becomes himself an employer of labour, and is entitled to the wages of a skilled steward. To the rigid definition of "fair rent" which we have given, we must in Ireland add a qualifying term—namely, that the tenant's reclamations and improvements should appear as an element in the calculation. The difficulties of an accurate estimate are, indeed, in particular cases, very great. We can scarcely expect either accurate justice, or perfect contentment as the unfailing result of any valuation; particularly among the class represented by the Cork farmer, who proved the exorbitancy of his rent by the recent increase of his family. We may add that the branch of the Land League accepted his economical views, and passed a resolution condemning the landlord.

The connexion of "Griffiths' valuation" with the subject of "fair rent" is more apparent than real: still the prominence into which it has been recently brought requires that we should refer to the circumstance under which it was made. The Valuation Act now in force was passed in 1852, when the prices of agricultural produce were exceptionally low; its object was to secure uniformity for fiscal purposes, not to fix the letting value; all rates and taxes were deducted, and not merely those payable by the tenant; and, in the southern and western counties, an earlier valuation was adopted, which was made under the depressing influences of the famine of 1846-7. Since the Act was passed the prices of agricultural produce have risen from 30 to 100 per cent. above the standard scale,† according to which the valuation was made; and some £3,000,000 have been expended under the Drainage and Land Improvement Acts, in addition to the private capital which has been sunk in the land. These circumstances render the valuation completely obsolete as a measure of rent; and we could, were it necessary, cite the highest authorities in support of this proposition; but perhaps the alacrity shown by the tenants, even at this moment, in their offers of "Griffiths' valuation" renders all other authority insignificant.

* "Tenure of Land in Ireland," by Judge Longfield in "Cobden Club Essays," p. 48.

† According to this scale, the price per cwt. of wheat was fixed at 7s. 6d., of oats at 4s. 10d., of butter 65s. 4d., beef 35s. 6d., &c.

The scheme put forward by Mr. Russell,* like that of the Cloyne priests, rests on fixity of tenure and certainty of rent, coupled with encouragement of occupying proprietors: but it differs from theirs in two important respects; instead of periodical valuations, or occasional adjustment by a scale of prices, he would have the rent fixed once and for ever; and his second innovation is that he would allow the tenants to redeem the rent pound by pound at twenty-five years' purchase. As to the former, the progressive increase in the value of land is shown by what we have already stated *apropos* of Griffiths' valuation; and it seems scarcely just to deprive the landlord of at least a share of the "unearned increment." And again, if prices were to fall, the tenant could repudiate, and the landlord would be helpless; while, if they continue to rise in the future, as they have done in the past, the landlord would eventually become merely a "quit-renter." The power of redeeming the rent by capital payments would, we believe, work wonders in the education of the tenants, the only danger being that thrift might become a vice, as it has done in parts of France. That, however, seems in Ireland a very remote evil.

Mr. Russell, as means to the end of creating occupying proprietors, would confer on a Land Commission compulsory powers of taking the estates of corporations, and those mortgaged beyond three-fourths of their value. We fear that most of the newly created "proprietors" would fall under the latter category, and the State would soon be in a position to take back its gift; but apart from this it is doubtful whether a case can be made out for so violent an "interference with the existing rights of property." It assumes the perfect success of a scheme of peasant proprietorship, and great difficulty in acquiring land through the ordinary channels. If these be admitted, we think corporate property might certainly be made available. As to mortgaged estates, we confess we anticipate graver difficulties in carrying out a compulsory purchase.

Mr. Errington, in the letter which we have prefixed to this article, points out that the "three F's" is only the re-appearance of a scheme advocated, as long ago as 1832, by a Mr. Conner; and believes that the "much-needed solution of the Land Question" will be found by its adoption. The originality of his plan consists in the method of apportioning between landlord and tenant the increase of value; the share of the former being made to depend on the *price*, that of the latter on the *quantity* of produce. The first "fair rent" should be determined, as a starting-point, by a "Supreme Land Court;" and, subsequently, periodical adjustments of the rent might be made at the wish of either party.

* "New Views on Ireland," cap. x.

Mr. O'Brien expresses an opinion, that the most limited measure which the Irish tenants will accept as a final settlement must include, (1) the extension of the Ulster custom; (2) the fixing of rents by some other means than the will of the landlord and the necessities of the tenant; and (3) an effectual amendment of the Bright Clauses of the Land Act.*

One more scheme we must notice for the solution of this knotty problem. It is that of Judge Longfield, a man eminently qualified by experience, learning, and position to speak with weight on this subject. He holds the now somewhat unpopular doctrine, that "the separation of the ownership from the occupation of land is an advantage to both parties—to the owner as well as to the occupier;"† and he proposes a system by which a tenant in any part of Ireland can acquire a "Parliamentary Tenant-right" in his holding, either by agreement with his landlord or on application to the Court. He fixes the tenant-right at seven years' purchase of the rent, which may be varied by the parties every ten years. If, at the end of the first ten years, neither proposes a change, the rent will remain unaltered for another period of ten years; but if either wishes to improve his position he makes the attempt, subject to a certain risk. Suppose, for example, that the landlord considers the rent too low—he is to serve notice on the tenant of the amount of the future rent. If the tenant agrees to pay this increased rent, the bargain is struck for another period of ten years, the tenant-right being also, of course, augmented in the same proportion as the rent. If, on the contrary, he objects to the new terms, he gives up possession, receiving compensation on the increased scale. The effect of which would be to deter the landlord from demanding an extortionate rent, since on refusal he would have to give the tenant seven times its amount. Now, if the tenant desires, at the end of any period, to diminish his rent, he in like manner serves a notice on the landlord; and in case of his refusal has to leave, receiving only seven times the proffered rent. This would make the tenant cautious as to claiming an unfair deduction. "This mode," the writer says, "of calculating the compensation makes it the interest of both parties to be reasonable." It must be noticed, however, that the Judge does not provide for a case which, we fear, would be only too common; namely, where *both* parties desired a change. And, further, as the eventual solution of any disagreement is that the tenant is to give up his holding with compensation, there might be a tendency to develop the angry feelings which it is his object to remove.

We have now briefly noticed the principal plans for the re-

* "The Parliamentary History of the Irish Land Question." p. 201.

† "Land Tenure in Ireland," by the Right Hon. Justice Longfield: *The Fortnightly Review*, August, 1880.

arrangement of the relations between landlord and tenant ; and, though it is scarcely probable that any of those plans will be accepted in its entirety by the Government, their authors have done good service in placing the problem clearly before the public. Discussion is the harbinger of reform ; and many Englishmen have been recently educated in Irish affairs—so far, at least, as to feel that something must be done, because the present relations are strained to the breaking-point. The two Commissions, whose Reports are daily expected, will furnish material for arriving at just conclusions on many interesting questions connected with the land ; and we presume that the Government measure will be influenced by their contents. It would therefore be premature on this occasion to enter into the consideration of the precise form that legislation should assume ; and we must content ourselves for the present with having proved from the poverty and insecurity of the tenant the necessity of reform.

Our duty, unfortunately, does not end here. If we now laid down the pen, we should be leaving unconsidered what we have described as the second manifestation of the Land Question. The present lawlessness of the country, no doubt, intensifies the cry for Reform ; but that is a tardy measure, and it is to be feared that the social condition of certain counties has become intolerable ; and also that the disease will rapidly spread unless checked by some prompt expedient. We shall not be suspected of joining, on the first appearance of an assassin with a blunderbuss, in a terror-stricken outcry for coercion. We cannot be reproached in the words of the old counsellor—

The truth you speak doth lack some gentleness
And time to speak it in. You rub the sore,
When you should bring the plaister.

Our traditions connect us indissolubly with the sympathies of the people ; and, if we declare for coercive legislation, it is in its most lenient form, and only because we believe that the fair fame of Ireland is being sullied by outrages, which a judicious measure would effectually suppress. With the Government the responsibility rests. They are furnished, day by day, with authentic reports. For their instruction agrarian crimes are classified, and outrages are tabulated, so as to reduce the state of the country to a numerical test. The information that Mr. Justice Fitzgerald had before him, when he delivered his remarkable charge to the Grand Jury in Cork, was probably in Downing Street the same day ; and we cannot doubt that clear-sighted Ministers drew the same conclusion as the Judge from the array of undetected crime.

Disaffection in a country swarming with armed men, under the influence of unusual excitement, may at any moment enter on a

new phase. That would indeed be a terrible evil; and if anything is calculated to bring it about, it is the sugar-plum policy of all rewards and no punishments.

And what is this bug-bear, Coercion, that everyone seems almost afraid to mention? It does not necessarily mean suspension of the Habeas Corpus, or any violent infringement of the liberties of peaceable men. It admits of all degrees, from what the French call "a state of siege," to additional powers for the posting of constabulary. We do not wish to see curfew introduced, or martial law, or arbitrary imprisonments, or a Court of Star Chamber in Dublin Castle. We should regret if the rights of meeting and speaking, open agitation, or any other constitutional inheritance of freedom, were curtailed for a moment. But what we do think is absolutely necessary, is some prohibition of unlicensed arms, and also some check on the fatal facility with which they are supplied to all classes of the population. A single firm in Dublin has been for some time disseminating revolvers through the country at the rate of 240 per week; a tempting advertisement appears in a Dublin journal offering those dangerous weapons at the low price of 10s. each, and Mr. Justice Fitzgerald refers to their being in the possession of every herd and farmer's boy. A vast proportion of the exceptional crime of the country is connected with the possession and unlawful use of fire-arms. Take these away, and intimidation is shorn of half its power. It is a very trivial interference with the liberty of the subject, to deprive him of that which he can only use for purposes of crime. But if it were even a greater hardship, the imperative necessities of society cry out for some such protection.

Until the 1st of June, 1880, Ireland had for thirty-three years been governed by "exceptional legislation." The Crime and Outrage Act was passed in 1847; the Peace Preservation Act in 1856; Habeas Corpus was suspended in 1866, and again in 1867; the Peace Preservation Act was in 1870, as a counterpoise to the Land Act, rendered extremely stringent. In 1873, the Westmeath Act, which remained in force for four years, and under which only six persons were actually arrested, completely crushed the Ribbon Society in that county. Lastly, in 1875, the various Acts were modified and continued. Whether the Conservative Government would, if they had remained in office, have asked Parliament for the continuance of coercion, cannot now be determined. The time of dissolution was so chosen as to render it difficult for the incoming Government to renew the expiring Acts before the day of their decease. This difficulty, coupled with the desire to reverse the policy of their predecessors, produced the following paragraph in the Queen's Speech, at the opening of the second Session of 1880. It will be read with interest at the present moment:—

The Peace Preservation Act for Ireland expires on the first of June. You will not be asked to renew it. My desire to avoid the evils of exceptional legislation in abridgment of liberty would not induce me to forego, in any degree, the performance of the first duty of every Government in providing for the security of life and property. But, while determined to fulfil the sacred obligation, I am persuaded that the loyalty and good sense of my Irish subjects will justify me in relying on the provisions of the ordinary law, firmly administered, for the maintenance of law and order.*

We think the time was unfortunately chosen for an experiment in Liberty. The result has at all events not corresponded with the benevolent aspirations of Her Majesty's Ministers; and we hope that, in the rebound, they may not be carried farther back than the point from which they started.

It is a humiliating reflection that no Irish Reform has ever been conceded until the attention of Statesmen has been enforced by violence or outrage. Without going so far as to attribute Catholic Emancipation to the fear of Rebellion, or the Disestablishment of the Church to the Clerkenwell explosion, we can understand that a stimulus is supplied by the exhibition of force, which wonderfully quickens the consideration of grievances. It is not only humiliating, it is also dangerous: for it places a premium on disaffection, it is a direct incentive to crime. Therefore, the duty of the Government is, not to shrink from the concession of Reform because it is demanded with threats, but to show that it is in spite of those threats, and not in submission to them that they undertake the task; and above all things so to vindicate the law, that it may be apparent to all that justice is done because it is just, and not because it has been preceded by the "stand and deliver" of political highwaymen.

The coming Session will no doubt see the introduction of an Irish Land Bill. We trust that it may contain the seeds of peace. Many months must, however, elapse before those seeds can germinate—many years before the goodly fruit can ripen. In the meantime the exigencies of society, the fulfilment of the law, the safety of life and property, require the protection of a vigorous administration; and, unless some sudden transformation takes place in the aspect of Irish affairs, we regard as a painful necessity the introduction of a moderate measure of coercion.

* "Hansard," 3rd Series, cclii. p. 67.

DE SANCTO THOMA AQUINATE
PATRONO CAELESTI STUDIORUM OPTIMORUM COOPTANDO.

—
LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

CUM hoc sit et natura insitum et ab Ecclesia catholica comprobatum, ut a viris sanctitate praeclaris patrocinium, ab excellentibus autem perfectisque in aliquo genere exempla ad imitandum homines exquirant; idcirco Ordines religiosi non pauci, Lycea, coetus litteratorum, Apostolica Sede approbante, iamdiu magistrum ac patronum sibi sanctum Thomam Aquinatem esse voluerunt, qui doctrina et virtute, solis instar, semper eluxit. Nostris vero temporibus, aucto passim studio doctrinarum eius, plurimi extiterunt, qui peterent, ut cunctis ille Lyceis, Academicis, et scholis gentium catholicarum, huius Apostolicae Sedis auctoritate, patronus assignaretur. Hoc quidem optare se plures Episcopi significarunt, datis in id litteris cum singularibus tum communibus; hoc pariter studuerunt multarum Academicarum sodales et collegia doctorum supplice atque humili obsecratione deprecari. — Quorum omnium incensas desiderio preces cum differre visum esset, ut productione temporis augerentur, idonea ad rem opportunitas accessit ab Encyclicis Litteris Nostris *De philosophia christiana ad mentem s. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici in scholis catholicis instauranda*, quas superiore anno hoc ipso die publicavimus. Etenim Episcopi, Academiae, doctores decuriales Lyceorum, atque ex omni terrarum regione cultores artium optimarum se Nobis dicto audientes et esse et futuros una pene voce et consentientibus animis testati sunt: imo velle se in tradendis philosophicis ac theologicis disciplinis sancti Thomae vestigiis penitus insistere; sibi enim non secus ac Nobis, exploratum esse affirmant, in doctrinis Thomisticis eximiam quamdam inesse praestantiam, et ad sananda mala, quibus nostra premitur aetas, vim virtutemque singularem. Nos igitur, qui diu multumque cupimus, florere scholas disciplinarum universas tam excellenti magistro in fidem et clientelam commendatas, quoniam tam clara et testata sunt communia omnium desideria, maturitatem advenisse censemus decernendi, ut Thomae Aquinatis immortale decus novae huius accessione laudis cumuletur.

Hoc est autem caussarum, quibus permovemur, caput et summa; eminere inter omnes sanctum Thomam, quem in variis scientiarum studiis, tamquam exemplar, catholici homines intueantur. Et sane praeclara lumina animi et ingenii, quibus ad imitationem sui iure vocet alios, in eo sunt omnia: doctrina uberrima, incorrupta, apte disposita; obsequium fidei et cum veritatibus divinitus traditis mira consensio; integritas vitae cum splendore virtutum maximarum.

Doctrina quidem est tanta, ut sapientiam a veteribus defluentem,

maris instar, omnem comprehendat. Quidquid est vere dictum aut prudenter disputatum a philosophis ethnicorum, ab Ecclesiae Patribus et Doctoribus, a summis viris qui ante ipsum floruerunt, non modo ille penitus dignovit, sed auxit, perfecit, digessit tam luculenta perspicuitate formarum, tam accurata disserendi ratione, et tanta proprietate sermonis, ut facultatem imitandi posteris reliquisse, superandi potestatem ademisse videatur. Atque illud est permagnum, quod eius doctrina, cum instructa sit atque apparata principiis latissime patentibus, non ad unius dumtaxat, sed ad omnium temporum necessitates est apta, et ad pervincendos errores perpetua vice renascentes maxime accommodata. Eadem vero, sua se vi et ratione confirmans, invicta consistit, atque adversarios terret vehementer.

Neque minoris aestimanda, christianorum praesertim hominum iudicio, rationis et fidei perfecta convenientia. Evidenter enim sanctus Doctor demonstrat, quae ex rerum genere naturalium vera sunt, ab iis dissidere non posse, quae, Deo auctore, creduntur; quamobrem sequi et colere fidem christianam, non esse humilem et minime generosam rationis servitutem, sed nobile obsequium, quo mens ipsa iuvatur et ad sublimiora eruditur; denique intelligentiam et fidem a Deo ambas proficisci, non simultatum secum exercendarum caussa, sed ut sese amicitiae vinculo colligatae mutuis officiis tueantur.—Cuius convenientiae mirabilisque concordiae cunctis beati Thomae scriptis expressa imago perspicitur. In iis enim excellit atque eminet modo intelligentia, quae quod vult, fide praeunte, consequitur in per investigatione naturae; modo fides, quae rationis ope illustratur ac defenditur, sic tamen ut suam quaeque inviolate teneat et vim et dignitatem; atque, ubi res postulat, ambae quasi foedere icto ad utriusque inimicos debellandos coniunguntur. Ac si magnopere semper interfuit, firmam rationis et fidei manere concordiam, multo magis post saeculum XVI interesse existimandum est; quoniam per id tempus spargi semina coeperunt finem et modum transeuntis libertatis, quae facit ut humana ratio divinam auctoritatem aperte repudiet, armisque a philosophia quaesitis religiosas veritates pervellat atque oppugnet.

Postremo Angelicus Doctor non est magis doctrina, quam virtute et sanctitate magnus. Est autem virtus ad periclitandas ingenii vires adipiscendamque doctrinam praeparatio optima; quam qui negligunt, solidam fructuosamque sapientiam falso se consecuturos putant, propterea quod in *malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis*.^{*} Ista vero comparatio animi, quae ab indole virtutis proficiscitur, in Thoma Aquinate extitit non modo excellens atque praestans, sed plane digna, quae spectabili signo divinitus consignaretur. Etenim cum maximam voluptatis illecebram victor evasisset, hoc veluti praemium fortitudinis tulit a Deo pudicissimus adolescens, ut lumbos sibi arcanum in modum constringi, atque una libidinis faces extingui sentiret. Quo facto, perinde vixit, ac esset ab omni corporis contagione seiunctus, cum

* Sap. i. 4.

ipsis angelicis spiritibus non minus innocentia, quam ingenio comparandus.

His de caussis dignum prorsus Angelicum Doctorem iudicamus, qui praestes tutelariorum studiorum cooptetur. Quod cum libenter facimus, tum illa Nos consideratio movet, futurum ut patrocinium hominis maximi et sanctissimi multum valeat ad philosophicas theologicasque disciplinas, summa cum utilitate reipublicae, instaurandas. Nam, ubi se scholae catholicae in disciplinam et clientelam Doctoris Angelici tradiderint, facile florebit sapientia veri nominis, firmis hausta principiis, ratione atque ordine explicata. Ex probitate doctrinarum probitas gignetur vitae cum privatae tum publicae: probe vivendi consuetudinem salus populorum, ordo, pacata rerum tranquillitas consequentur.—Qui in scientia rerum sacrarum elaborant, tam acriter hoc tempore lacessita, ex voluminibus sancti Thomae habituri sunt, quo fundamenta fidei christianae ample demonstrent, quo veritates supernaturales persuadeant, quo nefarios hostium impetus a religione sanctissima propulsent. Eaque ex re humanae disciplinae omnes non impediri aut tardari cursus suos, sed incitari augerique sentient; ratio vero in gratiam cum fide, sublati dissidiorum caussis, redibit, eamque in indagatione veri sequetur ducem. Demum quotquot sunt homines discendi cupidi, tanti magistri exemplis praeceptisque conformati, comparare sese integritate morum assuescent; nec eam rerum scientiam consectabuntur, quae a caritate seiuncta inflat animos et de via deflectit, sed eam quae sicut a *Patre luminum et scientiarum Domino* exordia capit, sic ad eum recta perducit.

Placuit autem hac super re sacri etiam Consilii legitimis ritibus cognoscendis perrogare sententiam; quam cum perspexerimus, dissentiente nemine, votis Nostris plane congruere, Nos ad gloriam omnipotentis Dei et honorem Doctoris Angelici, ad incrementa scientiarum et communem societatis humanae utilitatem, sanctum Thomam Doctorem Angelicum suprema auctoritate Nostra Patronum declaramus Universitatum studiorum, Academicarum, Lyceorum, scholarum catholicarum, atque uti talem ab omnibus haberi, coli, atque observari volumus, ita tamen ut sanctis caelitibus, quos iam Academiae aut Lycea sibi forte patronos singulares delegerint, suus honos suusque gradus etiam in posterum permanere intelligatur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub Annulo Piscatoris die IV. Augusti MDCCCLXXX. Pontificatus Nostri anno Tertio.

THEODULPHUS CARD. MERTEL.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.

1. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*

IN the September issue Dr. Kayser concludes his interesting paper on Egypt with further details on the Catholic united Kopts. To the October issue I contributed a critique on Dr. Mejer's biography of Febronius. Professor Mejer, University of Göttingen, describes Febronius entirely from a Protestant point of view, attacking at the same time in most unqualified terms the Catholic bishops of Germany of our time, and taunting them with want of patriotic feelings. On the contrary, he praises the conduct of Febronius, and excuses where he cannot defend him. Nicolaus von Hontheim was professor in the University of Treves, and in 1748 was appointed auxiliary bishop to the Archbishop Elector. When about sixty years of age he published the famous "Febronius," a work in which his flattery of secular princes is only equalled by his impertinence to the Holy See. By command of Pius VI. he published a retraction; but Mejer's book leaves no doubt that the retraction was insincere, and that he remained the same Febronius as he was before. A new process was opened against him in Rome, but before he was called to stand before his judge, he died at Treves in 1790 at the age of ninety years. Closely connected with the biography of Febronius are the articles commenced in the November issue on "The Wanderings of Jansenism through the Catholic countries of Europe." They open with the history of the church of Utrecht, and the support it derived for many years from the Abbé Bellegarde, formerly canon of the cathedral of Lyons. Owing to his unceasing efforts Jansenism could boast of a propaganda embracing Austria, Italy, Spain and Portugal. According to Picot ("Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise pendant le 18 Siècle"), the sum spent by Bellegarde in propagating Jansenist literature amounted to ten millions of francs. The church of Utrecht sent its emissaries principally to Vienna, where Van Swieten and De Haen, both of them surgeons to the Empress, exerted an immense influence. Bellegarde himself proceeded to the Imperial Court, and was favoured with the Empress's assurance that she would support his endeavours to have the church of Utrecht recognized by Rome. Afterwards he saw the famous Bishop of Pistoja, Scipio Ricci, and had intercourse with Tamburini, the head of the Italian Jansenists. But all the exertions of the Jansenist party to gain recognition by Rome were crushed by the immovable firmness of the Holy See. Clement XIV. declared that his recognition could be obtained only on the condition "incende quod adorasti, adora quod incendisti." Thus runs the narrative of Canon Mozzi in his "Storia delle Rivoluzioni della Chiesa d'Utrecht." In a second article our author describes the introduction of Jansenism into Austria.

Foremost among its apostles were two priests—Canon Stock of Vienna, and the priest Stöger. Thousands of French Jansenistical books and pamphlets were translated into German; even the seminary students were nourished on them. Cardinals Frankenberg of Malines and Migazzi of Vienna strenuously protested against this attack on the liberty and faith of the Church. Their protests were not only not attended to, but they themselves had to suffer most unworthy treatment at the hands of the Government.

2. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach.*

Father Baumgartner continues his study of the poetical works of Joost van den Vondel. But our interest is principally claimed by the two articles contributed by F. Ehrh on "Blessed Albertus Magnus." On November 16, 1280, in the Dominican convent at Cologne, there went to his eternal reward one of the most remarkable men the world has ever seen, statesman, philosopher and theologian. Albert of Laningen (a small town in Bavaria, and in the diocese of Augsburg), when studying in Padua, became acquainted with Fr. Jordanus of Saxony, who afterwards became General of the Dominicans, and from him received the habit of S. Dominic. It is not quite certain, but recent historical investigations have rendered it probable, that Albert's first appearance in Paris was about 1220-1230; whereas the previously common opinion made him appear at the Parisian University only in 1245, when he was appointed by the General of his Order to teach theology there. After his return to Cologne, in 1248, he became Lector of Theology, and among his disciples was Thomas of Aquin. In 1256 Albert was summoned by Pope Alexander IV. to Anagni, where he solemnly refuted the book published by William of St. Amour against the admission of religious Orders as teachers of divinity in the University of Paris. For two years Albert was Bishop of Regensburg, but in 1262 he resigned his episcopal office and retired to Cologne, where he spent the rest of his life in the Dominican Convent. In Cologne Albert was a prominent figure; in the violent struggles of that time between the city of Cologne and the two Archbishop-Electors, who encroached on the liberties of the citizens, it was to the Dominican monk that both parties applied, declaring they would submit to his arbitration. Albert pronounced judgment in favour of the city. What most interests us here is the influence of Albertus on Catholic philosophy. There are other scholastics, as his disciple S. Thomas, who surpass him in profoundness of science; but in breadth of view and extensive knowledge he is second to none. Before the time of Albert Western Europe possessed of Aristotle only the books on logic, and of Plato only the "Timæus." But just in the beginning of the thirteenth century a new world was disclosed by the translation into Latin of all the writings of Aristotle. Strange to say, his works on psychology, metaphysics and physics were first translated by Syriac Christians into their language; of these versions were published in Arabic, and from the Spanish Arabs they found their way into Western Christianity. Owing to the fantastical and dangerous systems of the Arabian philosophers, as of

Avicenna and Averroes, manifold errors had been introduced into the works of the great Greek philosopher. It was the work of Albertus to reconquer for the Church the works of Aristotle, by purging them from these errors, and bringing them into harmony with Christianity. Hence he commented on them, but in a rather independent manner. Although Albert cannot entirely free himself from the influence of Aristotle, venerating him, as he does, as the greatest philosopher that ever existed, on the other hand, he not seldom undertakes to correct his opinions and establishes his own system in opposition to him. Above all scholastics Albertus has won a singular reputation for his increasing and keen observation of Nature. His treatises on plants (*"Libride Vegetabilibus et Plantis"*) have called forth the unqualified admiration of Alexander von Humboldt, and were recently published by Professor Jessen. Albert is excellent likewise for his explanations of many books of the Bible. His talent as a very sober interpreter, who is chiefly concerned to expound the literal sense, has been duly recognized not long ago by German Protestant divines. Like all the great scholastics, Albertus is also a mystical writer; to his extensive knowledge of the spiritual life, volumes xii., xx. and xxi. of his works amply testify. Whoever takes pains to inquire into the writings and merits of this remarkable man, who, for the unparalleled purity of life and the labours sustained for the maintenance of the Catholic Church and the Holy See, has been decorated by the title of *"Beatus,"* will gladly concede him the praise sculptured beneath his statue in Cologne Cathedral: *"Philosophorum flos atque doctorum, scholae morum."*

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Scuola Cattolica. 30 Settembre, 31 Ottobre, 1880.

The Pope-King and the Roman Malaria.

THE *Scuola Cattolica* has two articles, the one in its number of September 30, the other in that of October 31, on the insalubrity of the Agro Romano. In the first it examines some of the alleged causes of the pestilential miasma now affecting a large tract of land which was thickly populated in ancient times. Is this to be attributed to man's neglect or to the action of indomitable physical forces? Enmity to the Papacy and to Catholicism has disposed numbers to attribute the growth and spread of this miasma to culpable neglect on the part of the Papal Government. The King, in whose territory the Agro Romano lay, was bound to have provided for the interests of his subjects, but has failed to do so. The Liberals of Italy have been foremost in such imputations, and no sooner had Rome been seized by the Revolution than commissioners were appointed for rendering the Agro Romano healthful, draining the Pontine Marshes, and regulating the course of the Tiber. What success has attended these endeavours, so pompously announced, the experience of the last ten years has demonstrated. A sub-commission, charged with investigating the causes which have led to the present insalubrity, all

but unanimously agreed in inculcating the Popes. The prosperity of their subjects, it was said, was of little importance to Sovereigns who had all Christendom tributary to them; nay, they even preferred to have their capital girdled by a pestilential marsh to being surrounded by a rich population, adverse, possibly, to their temporal power. The appointment of the commission, in fact, was a subtle piece of malice, planned with the view of enabling the Italian Government to denounce to Europe the ineptitude of the Holy See's rule. The groundlessness of these charges has been made patent by their own mortifying failures; but their falsehood might have been gathered at the time from the admissions of the very engineers whom the Government employed, men most favourable to it in their sentiments. Several of these have alluded in their printed statements to the many previous efforts made by the Pontifical Government to remedy the evil; and, in particular, one of them, whose report was considered the most valuable, after speaking of the populous towns and numerous palaces existing in ancient times near the mouth of the Tiber, where death and desolation now reign, observes that the profound change which has taken place is to be attributed to natural causes. Man, he affirms, has had little to say to it. All these reports, with a happy inconsistency, were bound up in one volume with the sweeping accusations of the commission against the Papa-Re. The economic administration of the Agro Romano under the sway of the Popes continued to be taxed by their enemies with its present wretched state—in particular, its division amongst large and rich proprietors, and the alleged indifference and ill management of the religious corporations owning land there. For not having applied a corrective to these abuses, and to the mischief thence ensuing, the Pontiff-Kings were held responsible.

The writer satisfactorily disposes of these and other heads of accusation, and in his second article examines what he considers to be the true cause of the pestilential state of the once flourishing Agro Romano—namely, the formation of a delta at the mouth of the Tiber, caused by its gradual alluvial deposits. It is true that this large area of land, now a desert, was once populous; but this was at a period when the said delta had not been deposited. When the estuary of the Tiber was at Ponte Galera, and the sea bathed the foot of the hills which form the outer portion of the Agro, all the lower ground, now a pestilence-breeding swamp, was no doubt covered by the inflowing sea waters, constituting a sort of bay or lagune (for it had probably even then a cordon of sand-hills between it and the sea), but deep enough not to become stagnant or to foster a rank deleterious vegetation. But as every year the Tiber brought down fresh detritus, the soil was gradually raised, while the sand-hills were also continually increasing, and this delta in course of time was formed, in which the overflowings of the river (of which the writer likewise explains the causes) remain in shallow pools without exit, under an Italian sun. The whole process and its results are followed in detail by the writer, who notices also the ineffectual measures undertaken to find a remedy

by running a canal through the sand; but want of space forbids our doing more than directing the reader's attention to his full treatment of the subject. Another article is promised.

La Civiltà Cattolica. Settembre 4, Novembre 6, 1880.

Christianity and Democracy.

WE have read with interest two articles which have appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the first entitled "Of a future Christian Democracy centred in Rome," and the other headed "Of Christianity and Democracy." In the former article the reviewer examines the notion put forward by a "Liberal Catholic" of a future Christian Democracy having its centre in Rome, which should recognize the Pope no longer as Sovereign but as the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and Arbiter in civil differences. He demonstrates the absurdity of this idea, both on the part of the hypothetical democracy which, if truly Christian, would never endure that any one should dominate in Rome save the Pope, and also on the part of the Pontiff himself, who would in such case be reduced to the state of a subject or of a prisoner, as he is at present.

In the second article the reviewer proceeds to examine the intrinsic relations which the author supposes to exist between democracy and Christianity, and from which he deduces the moral necessity that the last and most perfect triumph of Christianity in the world must be effected under the democratic form. True, he laudably insists on the necessity of a different sort of democracy to that with which we are at present threatened, which he stigmatizes as satanic in its tendencies, and which is one purely of demolition. The future democracy must be one that can build up, and, when the time comes, God will raise up giants for this purpose. Pigmies can pull down—profane hands and brutal instincts are all that is needed for such work; but to reconstruct there must be the spirit of order and of charity and heroic self-sacrifice. Democracy, to be genuine and enduring, must also be founded on faith in Jesus Christ, and must discard rationalistic philosophy and unbelief. He defines it as "the reign of justice, and the exact knowledge and observance by every man of his own duties." So far the definition would suit any good government, whatever its form; the remainder of the definition is more specific; "the nullity of fictitious privileges and the equality of rights in all"—that is, of rights political and social; an equality which implies, be it observed, the removal, not of "fictitious" only, but of all privileges. Christ, he says, was "the first Democrat, and the Gospel which He promulgated and imposed on His followers was this very democracy, as thus defined." Not to speak of the indecency of applying such an epithet to our Divine Redeemer, it is untrue to say that the Gospel He preached has any connection with political and social democracy. The writer confounds the natural and spiritual orders. Christian equality is to be found in the latter, not in the former. Our Lord never concerned Himself with political rights and privileges, and, with the one exception of the rule He laid down of "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and

unto God the things that are God's," no other rule with the least political bearing is to be met with in the New Testament. Christianity can accord with any form of government, but, so far from its being true that Christ commissioned His Church to establish democratic institutions, its own constitution is essentially hierarchical. It is a kingdom, not a republic, although a kingdom not of this world. The whole subject is well drawn out, but we pass on to advert briefly to the reviewer's treatment of a maxim which the "Liberal Catholic" styles "the just and supreme formula of democracy"—viz., "that no one has a right to what is superfluous so long as there is any one else who lacks what is needful;" and this, he says, flows as an inevitable corollary from the command of Christ: "Quod superest date eleemosynam."* This maxim, taken as it stands, would justify the fundamental thesis of Socialism. The confusion arises from the word *right*. Socialism would substitute for the charity which Jesus Christ enjoins a justice of its own invention, which belongs neither to the natural law nor to that of the Gospel, the sanctificator of nature. It assumes that he who possesses anything is bound on the score of *justice* to share what he owns with him who has a deficiency, thus making the alms of the rich an act of justice, not a work of charity. But since every right has its corresponding duty, so every duty has its corresponding right. It would follow, then, that the poor man has a title to the property of the rich, and of any who are in easier circumstances than himself, and can accordingly claim a share of it. The consequences of such a doctrine are obvious. Now, it is true that a sacred duty of succouring the poor rests on the rich, but not on the ground of justice towards the poor, but of obedience to the laws of charity laid upon them by God, for alms-giving is a duty of charity, expressly commanded by God both in the natural law and in the evangelic precept of love. The right, therefore, is on the part of God who enjoins, not on that of the poor man who can exact; and when the rich man fails in his duty of fulfilling this law, it is God he directly offends, not man's right that he violates. Our Lord in saying "But yet that which remaineth give alms," had no intention of depriving the rich of the natural rights of property for the benefit of the poor. This would directly lead to Socialism, an enormity which the Church alone can avert, in the order of ideas, by the light of its truth, and, in the order of facts, by the flames of its charity. The question is a very practical one, especially in the present day, and accurate ideas, as well as accurate language embodying these ideas, are of vital importance.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Octobre, 1880. Paris.

Saint Methodius, Apostle of the Slavs, and the Letters of the Sovereign Pontiff's preserved in the British Museum.

THE history of Saints Cyril and Methodius, called the Apostles of the Slavs, is, says Fr. Martinov, S.J., the writer of this article,

* St. Luke xi. 41.

one of those in which no advancement can be made until the *sources* have been first carefully and critically studied. And, in spite of the labours of eminent writers—Dobrovski, Schafarik, and a multitude of others—this preliminary study still needs to be prosecuted. Besides, new discoveries are constantly calling for new study. M. Voronov, a professor at Kiev, scarcely three years ago published the most remarkable and exhaustive critical study of these historical sources, and already some of his conclusions have been falsified by the still more recent discovery of materials. The chief of these are the letters of Sovereign Pontiffs preserved in the British Museum, several hundreds in number, and belonging to various periods—the sixth, ninth and eleventh centuries. The MS. of the Museum is numbered 3,873 of the Supplement, and is a quarto, of the beginning of the twelfth century, made by one copyist—a collection of the kind of those of Deusdedit or Gratian. Fr. Martinov in this article follows M. Ewald's study on these MSS., published in the *Neues Archiv* for 1880 (vol. v. pp. 275, 415, 505, 507, under the title, “Die Papstbriefe der Brittischen Sammlung”), and with special reference to the letters of John VIII. and Stephen IV. bearing on St. Methodius, the Apostle of Pannonia. These letters, he says, “illuminate the grand figure of the Apostle of the Slavs with rays as unexpected as glorious,” and still further light will doubtless be gained when the complete text of the letters is published. The collection contains, in series i., 138 letters of Gelasius I., Pelagius I. and Pelagius II.; series ii., 87 letters of Alexander II.; series iv., 55 letters of John VIII. (872–882); series vii., 31 letters of Stephen VI. (885–891), &c.; and out of the whole collection 233 letters have never been published.

The letters of John VIII. throw new light on a point of history hitherto shaded in great obscurity—Was St. Methodius, as Archbishop of Pannonia, really subjected to persecution at the hands of the Bavarian episcopate? and if so, what is the precise epoch of that persecution? Saints Methodius and Cyril, brothers, came into Moravia at the invitation of Prince Rostislav, and there introduced a liturgy in the Slavonian language, the Sovereign Pontiff approving of this innovation. The Bavarian episcopate claimed the sole right of exercising the ministry in Moravia and Pannonia, and regarded the two brothers as intruders and disturbers of the peace. The Moravian Prince meditated national independence, and to help it wished to withdraw the country from the influence of the German clergy. A Slavonic rite appeared to him to help his plans. Hence constant wars hindered the apostolate of the brothers. The war went against the Moravian Prince, who was delivered up to his enemies by his nephew Sviatopolk. The German prelates imitated their Prince; and although Methodius had been invested with the archbishopric of Pannonia by the Pope, they not only refused to acknowledge him, but the Archbishop of Salzburg, with his suffragans, cited Methodius before them and condemned him to prison. The only author who has been hitherto cited for this fact is an old Slav biographer of the Saint, supposed to have been one of his disciples. His testimony is quoted by Fr. Martinov: he says that Methodius was banished to the country of the Suabians, and there

detained two years and a half. Most historians attach great value to this testimony, others hold it to be of little if any value. Ginzell, placing the supposed exile in 871-873, rejects it as impossible—the Saint was in Pannonia at that time. But the letters of John VIII. in the British Museum definitively settle the question: the Slav biographer was right. There are three letters of same date from the Pope—one to Adalvin, Archbishop of Strasburg, and two to two of his suffragan bishops. They accompanied an instruction (also preserved) to Paul, Bishop of Ancona, legate to Germany and Pannonia. The latter was charged to maintain the rights of the Holy See in Pannonia. "I am sent to you," said the legate, "not to discuss the question of the diocese of Pannonia, but to restore it to him whom you have for three years violently deprived of it." The Pope even excommunicated the above prelates, and Methodius was restored to his see. In 880 John VIII. approved of Mass being said in Slavonic, though it had been one of the special instructions to the Papal legate to prohibit Mass in that tongue to Methodius.

Among the letters of Stephen VI. one refers to Methodius. It is entitled "Commonitorium," and contains instructions given to the legates sent by the Pope "ad Slavitos"—*i.e.*, to Sviatopolk, Prince of Moravia. Three things are worthy of note in this document:—1. It gives in substance the Catholic doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost—"Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio, nec ingenuus ut duo patres, nec genitus ut duo filii, sed procedens dicitur;" and points out the Roman Church as the inheritor of the gift promised to St. Peter, "confirma fratres." 2. It contains a formal prohibition to celebrate Mass in Slavonic. How this can be reconciled with the express approval of John VIII., Fr. Martinov discusses in detail—it was a matter purely disciplinary. 3. It speaks of the fasts of the Church: "De veneratione jejuniorum firmiter tenete sicuti in sua decrevit epistola," &c. This reference is to a famous letter of Stephen to Sviatopolk, the authenticity of which is placed beyond doubt by the discovery of these letters of the same Pontiff. M. Ewald raises some further doubt, chiefly about the chronological arrangement of the collection of Papal letters, which Fr. Martinov discusses at length. This letter of Stephen VI. has been the subject of much controversy; has been accepted by Wattenbach and others; rejected by Ginzell, Ratchi, and a larger following. Thanks to the letters so long preserved and now discovered in the British Museum, criticism may begin by accepting the letter and its important contents.

Revue Générale. Novembre, 1880. Bruxelles.

L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE EN ESPAGNE is the title of an unsigned but instructive article giving a large number of details as to the present condition of education in Spain. Spain does not enjoy any reputation for educational advancement in France—perhaps not much more in the popular estimation of this country. In 1867, and again in 1878, the article says, a M. J. Manier published an Education Atlas of Europe, marking degrees of advance and efficiency by varieties of colour. Spain was painted dark, to signify the

night of its ignorance. "Why should it not?" many thought; "it is the last European abode of Catholic superstition and priestly domination—not yet freed from all remembrance of the Inquisition." In the Spain of to-day few persons are unable to read and write: in the northern and eastern provinces primary instruction is as advanced as in the most advanced nations of Europe. In the last decade of years the progress has been rapid: from 1870–78, 3,000 new schools were opened, containing 200,000 scholars, and have added to the State burden an annual expenditure of 4,000,000 of francs. In 1878, Spain counted 29,038 primary schools, containing 1,633,288 children between five and twelve years of age—nearly ten per cent. of the population. All the 15,000 to 20,000 *guardia civil* (police), and the 12,000 Customs officers, without exception, can read, write, count, &c. Nearly every soldier of engineers, artillery, and of the *service de santé et d'administration*, can do the same; and in every battalion of infantry and squadron of cavalry there is a school. The Spanish budget for public instruction was, for 1878, 26,000,000 of francs. Let it be remembered that since 1856, when other nations have enjoyed peace, Spain has been disturbed by civil wars, revolutions, and endless Cuban revolts. Again, in Spain, partly from local custom, partly from early precocity, a child over twelve years of age is rarely seen in a school; more northern nations swell their statistics with children up to fourteen and sixteen. There are few schools taught by priests or brothers—only 140 schools of the *Padres Escolapios* in all Spain. Primary instruction embraces Christian doctrine and Bible history, the three R's, grammar, elementary notions of agriculture, commerce; and for girls, design and domestic economy, with, of course, needlework. The superior grades add geometry, design, surveying, history, geography, general notions of physics, and natural history. Each *curé* gives religious instruction once a week. Popular libraries are integral parts of each public school. Primary education is *obligatory* in Spain, and *free* to all poor children. There are normal schools for masters and mistresses in each province, and higher schools at Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, &c., for higher literary and scientific training of mistresses already certificated from the normal schools. The favourable condition of Spain as to primary education is shown by the writer at length, both in absolute figures and by comparing its statistics with school statistics of the other European nations.

He then proceeds to a very detailed account of the subjects taught, the faculties, income &c., of the ten Spanish universities. These statistics, too numerous to be quoted here, are extremely interesting. The writer compares Spain with France, and shows that if Spain, *e.g.*, was content to progress in point of higher teaching no more rapidly than does France, she would have in her universities as students of law only 2,170, or 2,270 if she were measured by the population and proportion of Germany. Actually, Spain has 6,409 students in the faculties of law and 6,817 in medicine—three times the proportion of students in France comparatively to the population of France. The notable disparity between the income of the Spanish and other European, but more particularly English, universities, is well worthy of attention.

Notices of Books.

The Endowments of Man considered in their Relation with his Final End: a Course of Lectures. By Bishop ULLATHORNE. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.

A BOOK of calm and serene wisdom, a book of leisurely meditation, its texture woven in greatest part of patristic exposition and the lore of ancient saints, this work of the Bishop of Birmingham has already begun to grow on its audience, as solid and great books always do. It would be no compliment to it or its author to say that it was rapid or easy reading. But it is a book to use and to return to, a book to study and to take in, a book to become a kind of Summa of Christian thought, especially to the cultured laity of a generation almost wholly taken up with thought which is non-Christian or anti-Christian. No culture which does not embrace the philosophic and systematic knowledge of one's final end, and of one's faculties and opportunities, can be called true or absolute culture. The Catechism may do for the busy labourer and the rude but faithful multitude; the clergy have their curriculum of philosophy and divinity. But the men and women who have leisure, who may influence their generation, and who live amid the anarchy and noise of secularist and erroneous teaching, must take the time and the trouble which are necessary to learn their religion as a science. They must be at the pains to think things out, to analyze what they act upon, to dig down to roots and foundations; or else they run the risk which all badly-built structures run—of crumbling into wreck and ruin when a storm comes upon them.

We have often insisted, in the pages of this Review, that the Catholic body, in English-speaking nations, stands as much in need of "constructive" exposition as of controversy or spiritual reading. If we except a few sermons, admirable of their kind, hardly anything has been done in English which corresponds with such books as either Laforet's "*Dogmes Catholiques*," or Scheeben's "*Mysterien*"—widely different books, it is true, but agreeing in this that they give a philosophical exposition, for a cultured audience, of the principal points of revelation and of natural religion. Bishop Ullathorne's Lectures are an instalment of what we pray may grow into a complete development of the fundamental truths connected with our being as men and as Christians.

The difficulty in treating such matters as man's last end and his endowments of Nature and grace, is that they have been over-much treated—that is, in one way. They have become the very common-places of the preacher and the moralist. Their phraseology has become so hackneyed that the hearer is usually no more affected or arrested by it than he is by the beating of his own heart—an experience which would most assuredly startle him if it happened to him suddenly for the first

time. The most anxious work of the man who would stir his generation is to brighten up the meaning of well-worn language. This may be done in more than one way. It may be done by the preacher who invests old forms with new life by his imagination and his natural gifts; by the writer who so commands the best literary forms of his day that he makes men feel the points of contact between current thought and deep philosophy; or, finally, by one who so wields a wide mastery of the best thoughts of the best periods of the world's thinking, that he forces his generation to hear the deep voice of universal truths beneath current form of speech, like those who are made to hear the roar of the ocean in the common shells of the sands. Bishop Ullathorne's fashion is somewhat akin to that of the last-mentioned class. A long life, in which action and meditation have never been separated from each other, has given him a most complete acquaintance with the greater Fathers of the Church, and with the soundest philosophic thinkers of all times. This book of his is an invocation of the spirit of every man who has thought worthily of human dignity and human destiny to deliver its testimony to an age which runs after the external and the superficial. It is by no means a mere string of citations. Nothing kills the life of a book more effectually than inverted commas; nothing is duller than incessant extracts. The distinguished author has plenty to say that is his own. He has elaborated his views on the great truths of humanity and divinity in many an hour of reflection, preparatory, perhaps, to many a memorable discourse. But incessantly, behind his own speech, there is heard the solemn note of some undying voice out of dead centuries—some monumental Father or some wise man of a period older still.

The work was originally a series of lectures, and it bears traces of its origin. Under fourteen heads are treated all the subjects which concern the destiny, nature, supernatural gifts, and shortcomings of man; the Definition of Man, God's Image and Likeness in Man, Creation, Providence, Conscience, Evil, Justice, Punishment, the Fall, the Restoration and Regeneration, and the final Beatitude for which, by God's grace, man is intended. The author's general method is to take simple and obvious expressions of Christian doctrine, and to analyze them phrase by phrase, or word by word. But he does not express the doctrines or the dogmas at the beginning of his exposition: he rather works up to them, and discloses them, at the end, in their fulness and reasonableness. His summings up of long and intricate courses of reasoning are frequently not only very just but most striking and beautiful. Many of them would bear to be quoted, and doubtless will be quoted. We must confine ourselves to one or two. This is the conclusion of the chapter, *Why Man was not Created Perfect*:—

Had we not been tried and found wanting, until the inmost core of our nature was searched through with Divine light and grace, the deepest grounds for that profound and sweet humility, which is the soul's inmost expression of truthful sincerity, justice, and right dependence, would not be there to make her virtue most pleasing to God. These highest

motives of gratitude for the deliverance from evil would be wanting to the soul; and, finally, the overpowering argument to superabounding love, arising from the contrast between all that God has pardoned in the past and all the beatitude He gives in the everlasting present, would not be there to perfect the ardour of grateful love. For "to whom less is forgiven, he loveth less" (p. 278).

Some of the Bishop's most telling passages are those in which he illustrates, with deep-lined imagery, full of force and intensity, some half moral, half philosophical axiom, which sounds to shallow hearers just on the verge of a paradox. He is fond of these axioms. They are a most useful herald or signal, to bid men stop and listen to what he has to say. Many preachers and writers are tempted to say something slightly extravagant in order to be attended to; but none have a right to do so except those who have the gift of putting true and trustworthy generalizations into epigrammatic form, and then of showing their truth and trustworthiness by powerful illumination. The following is a good example of what we mean :—

The more sin the less freedom. Freedom lifts up our will to great and high things; sin depresses us to low and mean things. When we reflect what self is, we must see at once that a man chained to himself cannot be free. He is a captive within the narrow crypt of his egotism, and enveloped with the darkening shadows thrown off from his pride and sensuality. The pathways to the divine truth and eternal good are far beyond his flight; the wings of his spirit, both the wing of faith and the wing of love, are clogged with the mire of his ways, so that neither his heart nor mind can ascend to the regions of truth and justice. Fastened as with rivets to the things beneath him, his will loses its freedom in the clay of its concupiscence, and that concupiscence is blind, sensual, and egotistical of the body. A man is corporally free in proportion to the space over which he can move and in which he can freely act. He is mentally free in proportion to the breadth and elevation of the sphere of truth in which he can think. He is morally free in proportion to the grandeur and elevation of that justice to which his will can conform its actions. He is spiritually free in proportion to the greatness and purity of that good with which his soul is allied. But, though he has the freedom of responsibility, he has no large or generous freedom when, with the glue of concupiscence, his will cleaves to himself, and through himself, to the base things of this lower world, first to one and then to another, the bond slave rather than the master of what was ordained for his service, so that his will is neither truly free, nor luminous, nor elevated, nor pure (p. 218).

There is a breadth about the book which will be very refreshing to those who are wearied with much reading, with much contriving, or with much working. The life of the present day, even where there is no question of sin, is a kind of life which diverts the thought from the grand question of all questions. Mere excess of occupation, mere rapidity of living, merely the quick succession of one piece of news after another—all this so occupies one's available time and nerve-force that God is lost sight of. It does good, therefore, to the soul of man to sit and be silent in the company of such a book as this. It lifts us to simplicity and to purity: to simplicity, by presenting to us the only end of our being, the only philosophy worth living for; to purity, by

making us feel to how much nobler things we were born than to accumulate, or to make things pleasant on the earth;.

The world repeats the saying of the poet, that the proper study of mankind is man; but whilst the men of the world commend this study as of chief importance, they pronounce their own condemnation. For what man of the world cares to know himself? And how can any one know man who is ignorant of himself? The knowledge of his earthly frame is not the knowledge of man, nor the natural history that marks the external diversities of the various branches of the human family, nor the science of his mental faculties and their operations, nor those other sciences that investigate by parts the several elements that enter into his composition. . . . These partial studies of the components of human nature will not teach us the profounder things that belong to our humanity; on the contrary, from the mind absorbed in the study of the external man, this internal man is too apt to escape (p. 1).

Extracts might be multiplied, each of which would be full of that patristic philosophy which occupies itself rather with the development of truth than the objections of adversaries. But the book will be read; and although we have made extracts, yet we are very anxious to let it be understood that it is a book to which extracts cannot possibly do justice. Each chapter or lecture is closely woven; paragraphs are not inserted for the sake of being quoted, but in order to carry on the argument. In order to give some idea of how Bishop Ullathorne works an exposition through, let us choose the Fifth Lecture, on Self and Conscience, and follow it from beginning to end. Starting with the inquiry, "Why does man not care to know himself?" he points out that it is because our self-love has the ominous instinct that better knowledge would bring pain with it. Besides, to know one's self is difficult; because we come in contact, not with self directly, but only with the surroundings and circumstances of self. The moment a man comes to his pure self, without anything intervening, without the sense of God, without the sense of creatures, without even the images of creatures as distractions from self, then the taste of self is not pleasant. The author proceeds to define or describe "self." It is the "subjective man" in that nature in which he was born into the world. It is man's nature as taken apart from all that God does for him, and from all that God provides for him. A man whose will does not seek its content in God is a man who, by that very fact, is a lover of self. The utter unreasonableness of such self-love is seen in the phenomenon of pride. Pride is condemned by the natural sense of man, as well as by the voice of those cultivated thinkers who have had no light from revelation. But pride is nothing but self-sufficiency in operation. The fall of man in Adam implied the substitution of the love of self, as his dominant disposition, for the love of that good for which his soul was made. Regeneration, though it heals the soul does not heal the body. The fuel of concupiscence still continues to feed the consciousness of self. Hence the necessity of the great law of self-denial. Self-denial is the expression of that hatred which is the adversary of self-love. But are we right in not loving "self" in any sense of the word? Undoubtedly there is a good and

lawful love of one's self. But the true love of ourselves is the love of our objective good—of God; and therefore it is included in the love of God. Face to face with "self," claiming to rule and to lead "self," is Conscience. The Bishop's exposition of the nature and effects of Conscience is one of the best wrought out portions of this book. Conscience, implanted by God within us—the organ of God, the expression of God's will to us, at once a light, a sense, and a witness—is that mysterious element in the reason of man which imprints upon man's heart the imperishable obligations which he owes to the Divine Author of all things. Definitions or descriptions of Conscience are given, in the words of St. John Chrysostom, of St. Bonaventure, and St. Augustine. The elevation and clearness given to Conscience by Christian faith and charity are explained; the judicial, the recording, the warning office of Conscience are set forth in words of great force; and it is shown how conscience may be blindfolded and cheated, though never killed. The writer then enters into the relations of Conscience with self. Conscience is the light of truth—of truth as known by natural reason, and of truth as confirmed or revealed by supernatural means. To act against Conscience is to act against reason and God; to try to suppress Conscience is to extinguish reason, intelligence, law, order, the sense of good and evil, and whatever distinguishes man from the beast. Self, therefore, must be ruled by Conscience. The conclusion of the chapter is a homiletic exposition, which deserves to be quoted at length as an example of forcible and picturesque analysis, of the way in which self-love works.

We have given a very inadequate account of an admirable book. But there can be little doubt that most of our readers will, by this time, be reading it for themselves. It is a very good specimen of that "theology in English" which is now becoming absolutely necessary. It will be found most useful by the young pastor and preacher who wishes to make his exhortations a little more searching in their philosophy. It will help professors and teachers to innumerable useful thoughts, modes of expression, and passages of the great Fathers; and, as we have said, Catholics with any pretence to culture ought to make it not only a manual of instruction, but a test to measure the degree in which their earnestness is falling a sacrifice to light literature and non-Catholic reading.

No book is utterly out of the reach of criticism; but it will be quite understood that we would not, even if we might, criticize the book of a father and master like the Bishop of Birmingham. But, in truth, criticisms on the book before us would reduce themselves mainly to matters of form and external presentment. Perhaps, also, we might have something to say in mitigation of the severe judgment passed in the first lecture on the Aristotelian definition of man. But the first thing to do—and we do it with all possible haste and earnestness—is to welcome a work of laborious effort, of weighty thought, and of admirable effect. The present generation has known Bishop Ullathorne for a long time; but it may be safely said that we should have fallen far short of knowing him in the degree he deserves to be

known, as a thinker and a pastor, had he not given us the present book.

Manual of Universal Church History. By the Rev. JOHN ALZOG, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Freiburg. Translated, with additions, from the ninth and last German edition, by the Rev. E. J. PABISCH, Doctor of Theology and of Canon and Civil Law, President of the Provincial Seminary of Mount St. Mary's of the West, Cincinnati, Ohio; and the Rev. THOMAS S. BYRNE, Professor at Mount St. Mary's Seminary. Four vols., with Chronological Tables and Ecclesiastico-Geographical Maps. Vols. I, II, III. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1879.

IT is a remarkable fact that, until within a very few years, we have had no respectable text-book of a Catholic history of the Church in the English language. Wherever a course of Church history was attempted in our Catholic colleges, recourse was had, of necessity, to books in a foreign language, to Wouters's "Compendium," supplemented by the "Prælectiones" of Palma, or to the "Histoire de l'Eglise" of Fleury, or Rohrbacher, or Chantrel, or to the less voluminous works of Darras, or Drioux, or Blanc, or the still briefer manuals of L'Homond or Jorjy. There was always a disadvantage attending the use of any of these books. Some of them were by far too long; sometimes they were too lengthy on some points and too brief on others; sometimes there was a want of clearness and method, and in all cases there was the drawback of their being in a foreign language, which is found, practically, in a large class composed of students of various degrees of culture, to be a hindrance to progress.

However, thanks to the industrious labour of American translators and to the spirit and enterprise of American publishers, we have now several excellent books on Church history in our own language. Some time ago we received from the American press a translation of Artaud de Montor's "Lives of the Pontiffs," then a translation of Abbé Darras's "History of the Church," and lately Alzog's "Universal Church History," in an English dress. The American publishers set an excellent example of devotion to Catholic literature, and we are glad to see this example being, at length, followed by Messrs. Gill & Son, of Dublin, who are now giving us an admirable reprint of Alzog's "Universal Church History." The whole work will occupy four large octavo volumes, three of which have already appeared, bringing us down to the year 1649. The fourth volume will be published shortly, and will contain the history of the Pontificate of Pius IX. and much original matter concerning English-speaking countries.

The translators have left nothing undone to make this history of the Church all that could be desired. The edition from which the translation is made is the ninth and last German one, and one which has therefore received the learned author's latest emendations and corrections. As a manual of history, it will not be easy to find another which is so orderly and methodical, so full and comprehensive, so clearly and lucidly

written, and one which embraces the whole complexity of Church history in so reasonably brief a form. Though the author considers this work only the outlines of Church history, yet it possesses the interest usually found only in more developed narrative. It is singularly well-adapted to promote research and study in the young student by the comprehensive list of authors and works, prefixed to each chapter and section, which Dr. Alzog has consulted, and which he indicates as *sources*. Every page is, moreover, enriched by a perfect wealth of appended foot-notes. It may be said to be emphatically an educating work in the highest sense of the word.

But though so much can be truly said in praise of the work, and though the translators have done a great deal to make it perfect, yet a few blemishes remain in the very marrow of the book, which it would be perhaps impossible to eradicate without breaking up the very form of it. There is no unsoundness of doctrine that we have detected, but there seems to us a want of that pleasing quality which we find, for instance, in the "Church History" of the Abbé Darras—a tone of devotedness and sympathy towards the Holy See and the Sovereign Pontiffs. For instance, when Dr. Alzog is treating of some of the Popes of the Middle Ages and of the times immediately following, he seems too much influenced, in summing up their characters, by such writers as Platina and Villani. The Popes of those stormy days had difficult work to do in defending the Holy See against the lawlessness and violence of unscrupulous princes and nobles, and the historians of Italy were always on the side of such powerful parties. In their account of those times these writers give a false colouring to facts, and accuse the Sovereign Pontiffs of aggression and avarice, whereas it was the princes and nobles who were really guilty. Machiavelli, writing of the close of the fifteenth century, unconsciously gives us the key to a truthful view of the Papacy of that era when he says:—"To keep down the Papal influence, the power of the Pontiff was secretly neutralized by engendering jealousies and hostilities and causes of dissension in Rome between the principal houses of the nobility. Dissensions were sedulously promoted. The magnates of Rome were divided into two factions, the Orsini and the Colonnas; and pains were taken to have them with arms in their hands, so as to keep the Court of Rome weakened and disabled."* Hatred, however unjust, against the Popes is sufficient to account for all kinds of foul accusations against them. It does not seem as if Dr. Alzog had taken all these things into consideration in delineating the characters of Innocent VIII., Sixtus IV., and Alexander VI., all of whom lived in this era. He does not show much desire to defend the characters of the Popes, otherwise he would have found something better to say, for instance, of Sixtus IV. than that "It is difficult to determine whether his vices or his virtues were more prominent," and again—

Sixtus died August 12, A.D. 1484, in the seventy-second year of his age, and so generally detested was he, that a contemporary writer said of him, on the day of his death, "To-day has God delivered his people

* "Hist. Flor.," cap. ii.

from the power of this unjust man, who, destitute alike of the fear of God and the love of his fellow-men, sought only the gratification of his avarice and ambition" (vol. iii. pp. 63, 65).

Dr. Alzog's estimate of Sixtus IV. we consider to be untrue and unjust.

Again, in speaking of Innocent VIII., he yields too much to the malignity of this Pope's defamers, and leaves the reader under a bad impression. With regard to the much-misrepresented and much-maligned Alexander VI., Dr. Alzog has scarcely a word to say in his defence. He certainly does not go so far as his very worst enemies, but still a great deal farther, we believe, than real facts warrant. We are told by the translators in their Preface that Dr. Alzog does not hide the truth of facts, though they be unpleasant, and this is considered a great excellence in him. But the question is, What is the truth? We certainly want historic truth, even if in some cases it be not pleasant to contemplate, but we think Dr. Alzog has not always given it to us. There is no doubt that some of the Popes have been much slandered, and it is the duty of a candid historian, and especially of a Catholic one, to defend and exculpate them whenever it is possible. Dr. Alzog has somewhat failed in this important duty. On these matters we prefer the tone and spirit of the Abbé Darras, and we think the effect likely to be produced by him on young minds much more beneficial.

In sketching the character and career of that much-discussed and problematical friar, Jerome Savonarola, the author does not seem to be acquainted with the latest attempts to rehabilitate him. He does not help us to understand the extraordinary Friar of St. Mark's any better.

The history of the "Temporal Power of the Popes" in these volumes is to us decidedly unsatisfactory. The author does not show the origin of this power, and, in fact, dismisses that part of the subject without a word. He never for a moment alludes to the possibility of any such theory as that of the Popes having an inherent right to exercise such power. The translators and editors might well have exercised their privilege here to append a note, and have directed the student to the excellent little work of Cardinal Manning on "The Temporal Power of the Popes." But they have not thought of doing so.

These are the most marked defects of this otherwise most excellent and learned "History of the Church." The work has so many really good and sound qualities that we are sorry to find any fault with it. For practical use we think it adapted especially for the highest classes in our colleges, and for the Divinity student it is an excellent manual. Taking it on its united merits it is a very great boon to all Catholic educators in particular, and to all English-speaking Catholics in general. The editors have performed their task admirably, and we hope their labours will be rewarded by an extensive sale.

Anglican-Ritualism, as seen by a Catholic and Foreigner. A Series of Essays: with an Appendix, on the present position of the Church in France. By ABBÉ P. MARTIN, D.D., Licentiate of Canon Law, Professor of Holy Scripture in the Catholic Institute of Paris, and Honorary Canon of Cahors. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.

ANGLICAN-RITUALISM—a strange but expressive compound word, representing a strange and indefensible compound phase of Protestantism in England—is a remarkable book by a remarkable man. Its author is the Rev. Abbé Martin, who is best known in this country, at the present day, for his subtle criticisms on High-Church Anglicans, for his striking revelations of their system, and for his masterly exposure of their pretensions, claims, and policy, in his controversy with their foremost champion, Dr. Littledale. But, Abbé Martin is better and more widely known in his own country, and beyond its bounds, for his theological attainments as a divine, his familiarity with Oriental philology, and his many and valuable contributions in ecclesiastical history, liturgiology and current literature. As a recognition of his labours, Dr. Martin has been decorated as Canon of Cahors: and in order to utilize his Biblical powers, he has been appointed to the Chair of Holy Scripture, as professor in the University, or, as it is now called, the Catholic Institute of Paris.

Amongst other contributions from Abbé Martin's pen on Oriental subjects may be mentioned a series of essays from the "*Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques*," on the Armenian and Monophysitic-Syrian Churches. These works contain learned disquisitions on the religious history and ritual books of these Eastern communions. He also contributed a monograph on the Martyrdom of St. Stephen I., in the "*Revue des Questions Historiques*." Another of his theological contributions is entitled, "*Saint-Pierre, et le Rationalisme devant les Églises Orientales*." The Abbé has also entered a more strictly dogmatic region of controversy by publishing a Letter to Dr. Pusey, on the double Procession of the Holy Ghost, and the heresies and historical inaccuracies and fables boldly put forth by Mr. Meyrick and others at the "Conference at Bonn," and defended by newspapers at home. And as these pages are passing through the press, he has published another thoughtful pamphlet, bristling with facts and figures, on Catholic primary education in England.

Abbé Martin has thus proved himself a ripe scholar, a learned divine, and an accomplished controversialist in many fields of ecclesiastical letters. But, he has taken up another line of polemics which is distinct from all his former efforts, and which, perhaps, more keenly than they tests his sagacity, reading and information. It is a singular fancy which has made a French Abbé deal with purely English topics, and topics only indirectly affecting the Catholic Church, and not at all affecting the Church in France. But, Dr. Martin has been attracted, for many years past, to what is known, by a figure of speech, as the Anglican Movement, and to the body which teaches the Established

Religion in England. In this trying ordeal to a foreigner and an alien from the anomalous system which, with firm but delicate hand, he vivisects, the Abbé has acquitted himself with distinction and has emerged with applause. There is no doubt that he has logically and historically annihilated his most pretentious of opponents: and Dr. Littledale seems to admit his moral defeat, by his own silence, or his ineffective replies, by the silence of his organ of opinion in the press, and still more by the silence, the indefensible silence of the society which once patronized his pamphlet and then suppressed it, the English Church Union.

In addition, however, to the articles of the *Nineteenth Century*, and the *Contemporary*, which are reprinted in this volume, the Abbé has written a series of papers in the *Paris Correspondant* on similar topics. These papers have been reprinted in a pamphlet form; but they have not been collected, arranged, translated, or published in England. They fully deserve to be systematized and supplemented: and it is to be hoped that the publisher of the present book may be encouraged by its sale to issue a sister volume from these and similar materials. The Abbé's essays in his own tongue discuss these points: the Abolition of the Established Church; Existing parties in the Church of England; Anglicanism, and the use of the confession of sin to an English minister; Anglicanism, its characteristics, phases and transformations. These four treatises, together with Abbé Martin's essays in English reviews, give evidence of a wide knowledge of, and an intimate acquaintance with, the literature, opinions, and practices of the Ritualists and other parties in the Establishment. He quotes freely from the High Church papers, the *Guardian*, *Church Review*, and *Church Times*; from the Low Church, and Dissenting organs; and from the secular press, the *Times*, the *Post*, the *Standard*, and the *Telegraph*. Neither has the Abbé confined himself to a mere literary estimate of the Ritualist school of thought, by the study of papers, books, and pamphlets. He has made several visits to England and has had much personal intercourse and correspondence by letter with those who from their former or present position could afford him trustworthy information. He has cultivated the acquaintance both of converts and born Catholics, priests and laymen, and has held conference with clergymen of the Church of England at the head-quarters of Ritualism, in London and in the country. In short, he has mastered his subject, and the result of his manifold inquiries has resulted in the present volume, which is partly original and partly a reprint.

The reprinted portion of the volume contains, amongst other essays, the original paper by Abbé Martin, "What hinders the Ritualists from becoming Roman Catholics?" which produced Dr. Littledale's notorious "Reply." The new part consists of three essays, in the last of which Abbé Martin opens a direct attack upon Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome." That Dr. Littledale lays himself open to attack at the hands of a theologian, a liturgiologist, an historian, and a man of honour and probity, admits of no doubt. But, none could conceive the extent of the Abbé's exposure of Dr. Littledale's

controversial malpractices, who were not already familiar with the endless charges of inveracity, misquotation, false statements, calumnies, and reckless invective against everything, every person, and every dogma, bearing the title of Catholic, which crosses his path—charges which have been clearly proved against him by other opponents, and upon documentary evidence, in the *Contemporary Review*, in the *Month*, in the *Tablet*, in the *Weekly Register*, in the *Catholic Times*—charges which, as a rule, Dr. Littledale and his friends in the Church Union and the Christian Knowledge Society esteem it wiser to bow before and acknowledge silently, or to brave and allow judgment to go against them by default. Neither is the manner in which these charges are made less open to objection than their matter. The whole tone of the book, says Abbé Martin, “the discourtesy of the language employed, the vulgar levity with which serious charges are brought forward, the bitterness of the attacks, the severity and harshness of the expressions”—all are characteristic of Dr. Littledale. One quotation must suffice to show the opinion of a clergyman and gentleman, whose judgment may be considered unprejudiced, upon the controversial work of the foremost and main spokesman of the Ritualists. Abbé Martin is dealing with the work of the Church, “in furthering the spiritual and temporal welfare of the poor.” This subject, he says—

Is treated by Dr. Littledale in a tone at once of levity and scepticism, which makes one fear that he is incapable of approaching it with the delicacy so necessary in touching upon what relates to the spiritual life. He writes, indeed, in a manner which goes far to prove that he utterly misunderstands the Catholic Church; that he does not even know the A B C of her belief, her practice, or her laws. He is, evidently, in a state of mind in which he reads everything backwards, and interprets everything in a contrary sense to the reality (“Anglican Ritualism,” pp. 216, 217).

There is charity not less than discernment in the words. Perhaps, after all, Dr. Littledale is not so vicious as he is ignorant. It may be that he is more to be pitied than blamed.

We must not omit to add that an Appendix contains a most interesting essay, “On the Present State of the Church in France.” To this portion of the volume many of our readers will naturally, and at the present moment, turn in the first place. They will not be disappointed in what they shall find. And it would be remiss not to remark on the comely form of the volume in which the Abbé’s thoughts are reproduced; and still more ungrateful not to commend the translation of his original essays. The rendering from the French is idiomatic and scholarly. It does not read like a translation.

The Church under Queen Elizabeth: an Historical Study. By the Rev. F. G. LEE, D.D. London: Allen & Co. Two Vols. 1880.

ON the whole, we are disposed to think that the most remarkable fact about Dr. Lee’s History of “The Church under Queen Elizabeth” is, that it should have been written by a beneficed

clergyman of the Establishment—by a minister of that religion the commencement and early development of which it professes to tell the tale, and which continues to this day to monopolize Catholic property, to anathematize Catholic doctrine, and to glory in the Protestant principles then first enunciated.

Cardinal Newman, in the introductory lecture to his volume on the "Present Position of Catholics," seeking for some explanation for the popular English view of the Catholic Church, for its grotesque misrepresentations, and for the positive falsehoods which it welcomes and shelters, tells the old story of the picture of the lion as painted by the man: a parable in which he thinks we may read a true explanation of an undeniable fact. Had Catholics, he says, written the histories which Protestants have alone chosen to read, their views too might have been different. However, had Dr. Lee's book been written at an earlier date, the Cardinal might have pointed to it as an exception. Here we have a picture painted indeed by a man, and yet one to which the lion need certainly not object; for far from exhibiting his religion and its Foundress in the position of moral conquerors, Dr. Lee gives a life-like and accurate, and therefore a hardly flattering account of the history of the reign of Queen Elizabeth and of the rise of the Establishment. In these volumes the lion indeed rules triumphant; and, as our readers need not to be told, such a picture being far truer to fact than the daubs which often pass current for history, we, as Catholics, need not complain at the unusual occurrence of a Protestant writing that at which no Catholic can take umbrage.

Dr. Lee begins his history with Elizabeth's accession. He describes her coronation, which was effected with full Catholic ceremonial, and her reception of the Holy Communion with all but complete Catholic rites. Such conformity to the faith of her forefathers was, however, short-lived. Within a few weeks of her accession the two Houses of Parliament passed some momentous laws, "the full force and importance of which upon the National Church are even now scarcely realized," Dr. Lee tells us, and he adds—

All spiritual and ecclesiastical authority of every sort and kind (was) thus vested in the Crown, though now worn by a woman. . . . Furthermore, and at once, all ministers and officers whatsoever, whether temporal or spiritual, whether bishops or judges, canons or magistrates, parish clerks or pikemen, were bound to take an oath acknowledging the Queen to be "the only supreme governor of the realm as well in spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as in temporal."

These Acts were the cause of all the horrible persecutions which stain Elizabeth's reign, and which as Dr. Lee details them page after page, are, even at this distant date, most sickening to read. Elizabeth, however, a true Tudor, if wanting in every other virtue, can never be accused of lack of firmness in carrying out her will. She meant to establish the Royal Supremacy. She meant to be *de facto*, as well as *de jure*, "Supreme Governess of the Church." And as (if by Church we understand the Catholic Church) God's care for His vineyard and His promises to His people made this last intention impossible, she

practically destroyed, or, speaking more truly, she succeeded in silencing for a while the old religion, and established a brand-new faith, with the one all-important doctrine of belief in the Royal Supremacy as its basis. To this first principle all else, during her reign, was subordinated; and any failure to subscribe to it, whether in Catholic or Puritan, was most cruelly persecuted.

These persecutions were not long in commencing. The episcopate being Catholic, of course resisted these innovations to a man; but one by one the Bishops were either deprived, or imprisoned, or died, some few first escaping to Rome. The Queen, however, unheeding all opposition, caused a new service-book to be issued which, with a few trifling exceptions, was identical with the Second Book of Edward VI. Our space forbids our criticizing in detail the peculiarities of this substitute for the Missal and Breviary; but their character may be gathered from the fact that, according to Dr. Lee, the omissions in what is known as the "consecration prayer" were of so important a nature, as to make the reality of any consecration at all taking place doubtful. It follows, therefore, that supposing for argument's sake we grant that England still possessed ~~the~~ ^{the} State religion was yet for a hundred years without the Blessed Sacrament, and any true Communion was impossible. Dr. Lee says—

The Act of Uniformity enjoining the use of the revised service-book, indirectly decreed that after the Feast of St. John the Baptist, 1559, any one who said mass according to those rites of the Church of England, which had been followed essentially for nearly a thousand years, as well as any one and every one who heard mass, or administered baptism, or any of the sacraments, according to the old directions and services, or who used any but the new, should, for the first offence, be fined one hundred marks; for the second, four hundred marks; and if these respective fines were not promptly paid, imprisonment for twelve months followed; with imprisonment for life, and the forfeiture of all goods and chattels, if a third offence were proved. . . . On the day appointed, therefore, the public celebration of mass ceased. . . . As the records of this reign are examined, step by step, and the harrowing tale of persecution is told, it will be seen with what a high hand those carried affairs, who, by the use of might over right, had secured influence, authority, and power.

The Queen having thus disembarrassed herself of the old bishops and of the old services, yet still wishing to preserve the Episcopate as a form of church government, if not as a grace bestowing order, proceeded by the much questioned and often disputed consecration of Matthew Parker, to found the present succession of Erastian Bishops. Of this consecration Dr. Lee (after detailing numerous important ceremonial omissions) says, "Here then and in this manner the new succession began." The validity of this consecration, although he speaks very doubtingly, Dr. Lee does not altogether deny. He admits the possibility of real order having been bestowed on Parker (of true jurisdiction there was not, of course, a shadow), though at the same time frankly owning the many difficulties existing as to any complete proof, he seems to sympathize both with the Catholic Church and with the Eastern Christians in their disavowal of the validity of

Anglican orders. He quotes, without blaming, Canon Estcourt when he writes—

It may be confidently asserted that there is an unbroken tradition from the year 1554 to the present time, confirmed by constant practice in France and Rome, as well as in this country, in accordance with which Anglican ordinations are looked upon as absolutely null and void; and Anglican ministers are treated simply as laymen, so that those who wish to become priests have to be ordained unconditionally. Not a single instance to the contrary can be alleged.

Dr. Lee also tells us of a re-ordination by a Greek Archbishop; and of the severe reprimand, by authority, of an Archimandrite who communicated a London clergyman; this last being described as without the priesthood, and as belonging to an "unorthodox" and "Protestant" Church.

Whatever may have been the truth in Parker's case, if he really was consecrated a Bishop (which of course we may grant without its at all following that the Anglican succession of to-day is a true and real one), it must have been as much by good luck as by actual premeditation; for the value of the Apostolic succession and the true meaning of ordination seem to have been hardly realized at this date. The country was overrun by a multitude of foreign Protestants and of Englishmen who had merely received a Lutheran or Calvinistic "call;" and these preachers of the "new religion" seem to have been considered (perhaps not very wrongly) on an equality with the Episcopally ordained ministers. They administered equally the sacraments, occupied the livings, and were raised to capitial honours. The case of Travers is well known and to the point. On the strength of his foreign Calvinistic ordination, he was made lecturer at the Temple, and generally occupied the pulpit in the afternoon; in the morning it was handed over to the more orthodox "judicious" Hooker, who was, however, at a disadvantage, for as he preached *first*, his thoughtful sermon after Matins was usually flatly contradicted by an eloquent discourse after Evensong from the rival occupier of the same pulpit.

A still more remarkable fact bearing on the character of Anglican ordinations is the well-authenticated story of Archbishop Lancaster, who for some months *previously* to his own consecration as bishop was himself busy ordaining priests! We can here only beg all who are interested in the question of Anglican orders to study Dr. Lee's book for themselves; to the High Churchman, we need not say, the matter is of paramount importance. For all he advances on this, and we may add on every point he discusses, Dr. Lee gives us full and complete contemporary authority; he asks us to believe no fact for which he cannot bring unimpeachable witnesses. We need take nothing on trust: and the researches necessary to disentangle a connected story from the copious authorities quoted by Dr. Lee, must have involved him in a work of which it is difficult to exaggerate the labour, and for which we, in the interests of truth, cannot be too grateful.

There is one other feature of the English Reformation which has

been popularly misrepresented, and the placing of which in its true light we owe to Dr. Lee. We are within the mark, we believe, when we assert it to be a common Protestant belief, that the change from the old religion to the new was greeted as a sort of spiritual liberation by the English people; that they were groaning under the tyranny of a corrupt priesthood and of a foreign usurper; and that they welcomed the change with exuberant delight. Indeed, the popular text to denote the distaste of to-day for any Catholic restoration is, that it forms part of that "yoke which neither they nor *their fathers* were able to bear." A perusal of these volumes will, however, soon dispel this illusion. It would be as true to fact to descant on the joy of Poland at being oppressed by Russia, at the delight of Ireland at English rule, and the charms of the *ancien régime* for the French peasant, as to tell of any far-spread satisfaction in England at the loss of her old religion. Dr. Lee records well-authenticated stories of popular risings in defence of the Faith; of tortures bravely endured; of the spoiling of goods, and of deaths too horrible to be more than hinted at, all in the same sacred cause. His interesting and graphic volumes contain page after page of such stories. After reading them we need not be surprised at Elizabeth's success. Half-hearted persecutions, no doubt, generally fail in their object; but such drastic measures as she and her ministers devised, and which were fully and ruthlessly carried out, are more effectual. A church composed of martyrs is, no doubt, very powerful in heaven: but dead men cannot fight against the Royal Supremacy; and after the sufferings, which all who ventured to resist were called to undergo, it is not wonderful that a day at length came when it was only with bated breath that any ventured to question Elizabeth's spiritual usurpation, or to deny that a secular woman was "Supreme Governor of the (Anglican) Church."

Organ School for Catholic Organists. By H. OBERHOFFER, Organist of Luxembourg Cathedral. Translated from the third German edition by R. W. OBERHOFFER, Organist of St. Wilfrid's, York. New York & Cincinnati: F. Pustet & Co. 1880.

THE very complete "Organ School" of Prof. H. Oberhoffer is now at the service of English organists in an English dress. We wish we could be sure that it will be taken up as it deserves. There are two, and only two, classes of organists in this country; the one is that of the men who live by playing the organ and teaching it, such as the organists of the Anglican cathedrals, or the professional men employed by the corporations of large towns; the other, of those who play the organ merely on Sundays. In the latter class are the greater number of those who play even in our best Catholic churches. You can hardly expect men who are either amateurs or who at least teach the piano or the violin all the week and every hour of it, to spend much time in preparing for scientific organ-playing on the Sunday. There are a few churches where you do hear true organ-playing; but they are by no means the majority even of the churches which

have organs capable of playing organ music. And it need not be said that the number of those who can accompany the plain chant of the Graduale is smaller still. The carefully-translated, clearly-printed, and well-edited volume before us is calculated to produce a school of real organists. It is at once a preparation for the organ and an introduction to the special accompaniment of the Church modes. It is divided into six parts, of which the first (a short one) treats of fingering, and proposes exercises for the memory; the second is a fairly complete treatise on harmony, after the well-worn fashion—that is to say, making harmony, to our thinking, far too much of a mathematical mystery and too little of an experimental and progressive art. The third section (of some 80 pp.) is dedicated to the mysteries of Plain Chant. We are sorry to see the author writes an accompaniment to the “Preface” of the Mass. His rules for the accompaniment of the Plain Chant, however, are good and sensible. The fourth part contains ample exercises for the use of the pedals; the fifth is thematic form and phrasing; and the sixth treats of counterpoint and fugue, and contains several good and instructive examples of fugue. Three useful Appendices conclude the work, which we earnestly recommend to every organist who aspires to understand his noble instrument and his own position as a promoter of God’s worship by music.

Freville Chase. By E. H. DERING, author of “Sherborne,” &c.
2 Vols. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.

ALTHOUGH we do not generally notice and discuss novels, an exception must be made in favour of this latest work of Mr. Dering. If we say that it is a tale which contains much controversial theology, and a great deal of serious Catholic thought, it is possible that many readers may be frightened, and may consider themselves warned off. It remains true, however, in spite of a very common prejudice, that some of the very best novels are those which have a strong infusion of sound philosophy. The truth is, no novel worthy of the name can possibly be written without a strong “motive” in it; that is to say, without touching some one of those deeper human convictions which all men agree in recognizing. The novelists of this country have nothing but natural convictions to fall back upon, and therefore the large majority of current novels depend for their “philosophy” on the passion of love. A few venture to make use of such motives as filial duty, parental tenderness, honour, or patriotism. There are many reasons, however, why these are not so powerful or so interesting. But with Christians, supernatural motives may well be used, because with believers they are as full of interest as any that are drawn from Nature. The love of God above all things, the workings of that “Grace” which is such a real power in the world, the vicissitudes of a soul, the history of the Kingdom of God, the operation of the Holy Sacraments, all these have a powerful attraction even for those amongst us who are very far from being saints. Doubtless, a novel ought to be very far from being a sermon; or,

rather, one had better say that a novel must interest, amuse, and recreate; and if it does this, it may resemble a sermon or anything the writer pleases. Mr. Dering does not disguise his "controversy," or his Christian ethics. Yet the book is interesting, amusing, and attractive; and this, not in spite of the serious pages, but because there is in the book such an assertion of strong and rational purpose that the intelligent reader feels the moral of it all to be true and sound. A tale of real life may or may not be attractive, but a tale grounded on true human and Christian insight is sure to touch a human and Christian heart. The tale before us is that of a young Catholic gentleman, rich, handsome, and strong, who suffers the greatest of earthly sufferings, and heroically sanctifies himself by their ministry. The "intrigue" of the story is not, perhaps, all that it might be from the point of view of art. The knot of the story—the complication arising from the old device of the substitution of one child for another—is tied and untied with too lavish a use of improbabilities, and with too large an apparatus of nurses, villains, and narratives. Then the series of misfortunes or machinations which finally drive the hero into his brain fever is not only too great a strain on our feelings in the atrocity and the amazing persistency of the calamitous shower, but it almost succeeds in making us rebel against the writer, and cry out that so many chances could not all have failed, and so many letters and telegrams could not all have been suppressed. Perhaps this, after all, is a compliment to Mr. Dering's art, and not a proof of the want of it. At any rate it may be freely confessed that Lady Dytechley, who is the principal villain of the story, is the most powerful character-portrait in the book. No one can doubt about her for a moment. She gradually stands out of the page; no melodramatic heroine with paragraphs of declamation, but a mere "county" lady, speaking as such ladies speak, and storming, caressing, lying, bullying, and laying schemes which must mean murder, in language which, for perfect truth to Nature, is a triumph of the artist. The other villain, the Marquis Moncalvo, is not by any means so good. The principal heroine, Ada Dytechley, whom the hero was to have married, and who becomes the bride of another by the train of harrowing ill-luck to which we have alluded, may be a possible young lady, but she is a strange compound of feebleness and violence. There are a number of characters whom the hasty reader will find it somewhat trying to keep distinct. The strong part of the book, however, is its Christian (Catholic) spirit; and it is not the least of its merits that it contains clear, neat, and eloquent expositions of a number of points of faith and morality. The style is clever, agreeable, and trenchant, with a pleasant ripple of humour showing itself from time to time. It is altogether a book which may be strongly recommended and which will do good.

Tractatus de Actibus Humanis. Auctore GULIELMO J. WALSH, S.T.D.
Dublin : M. H. Gill et Filium. 1880.

THE learned author of this volume, now President of Maynooth, was previously Professor in that College of both Dogmatic and Moral Theology. In the course of his lectures on the last-named, he had observed, he tells us, that the brief and meagre treatment of the important subject of "human acts" in Gury's admirable "Compendium," had led recent editors of it to supply deficiencies and lend it fulness by copious notes. We quite agree with Dr. Walsh that a book like Gury thus added to and explained in ever-recurring foot-notes or appendices is not a satisfactory manual—certainly not attractive to the young student. Ballerini's Gury has always been to us, spite of its merits, a most teasing book. Dr. Walsh judged that he would accomplish a useful task if he composed a treatise of sufficient fulness and detail, which should follow the plan and method of Gury, and yet be characterized by that unity, homogeneousness, and consequent clearness, that would result if the work were the native design of one author.

Thus, the writer modestly suggests that his volume is only, as it were, a resetting of old treasures, but it is, as a perusal of it at once shows the theologian, very much more than this. Indeed, it is, so far as a manual of theology can be, an original work. It retains, for the benefit of professors and students, the form of Gury's book—even his distribution into chapters and sections; but the erudition and labour bestowed on it by the author make it distinctly his own. It is great praise of it to say that it is worthy of the College from which it emanates. An examination, rapid but sufficiently complete, persuades us that it is, in its own special line, a fitting companion to Murray's "De Ecclesia" and Crolly's "De Justitia et Jure." Dr. Walsh appears to contemplate the probability of continuing his task, and treating other headings of moral theology after a similar manner. It is greatly to be desired that he may find leisure to do this; he will be bestowing a boon on theological students.

There are points and questions in Dr. Walsh's treatment on which we should be disposed, with great diffidence, to disagree with the learned author. There is no more interesting subject than that which is concerned with the essence of morality itself. The question, "Why is a human act good or bad?" is one which Dr. Walsh fully discusses.* He cites and adheres to the solution of St. Thomas of Aquin—that an act is good or bad because it is conformed or not conformed to a certain law or rule, and that this rule is the *lex æterna*, or eternal law. This, so far, is beyond doubt right and excellent. But we hardly follow him in his proof of this position. No other law, he says, except God's eternal law is obligatory on all creatures universally. But the dictates of reason are just as universally obligatory. In fact, the law of God, or the eternal law, is only known by the dictate of the reason of man, in the last resort. And there can be no "obligation" arising from the

* Pp. 111, et seqq.

existence of the law of God unless that obligation is recognized by the reason of man. The truth is, that the eternal law—by which is not meant any order or prohibition on God's part, but the *rationes æternæ* of His intellect and will, arising from the necessary relations between the Creator and the creature—this law, we say, and human reason, as a law, are completely co-extensive. Neither St. Thomas nor St. Augustine says that an act is evil because it offends God, or because God forbids it, but because it is against God's "law." The line from St. Augustine which our author quotes, could be shown not to contradict this, if space allowed. This meaning of the *lex æterna* should have been, we think, more clearly brought out. We are far from saying Dr. Walsh is not perfectly acquainted with it. But there is, to our minds, a want of clearness in the first few pages of his otherwise admirable exposition of "morality." We submit that the consequence of teaching that God's "prohibition" is necessary before there can be "formal" sin would be, that an infidel who did not know there was a God could not commit sin; whereas it is St. Thomas's clear teaching, and the dictate of common sense, that any man who has the use of reason and rejects, or does not conform himself to the *bonum honestum* as far as presented to him by his reason—that is, his last end, and the means to attain it—may commit grievous sin.

Young Ireland: a Fragment of Irish History. 1840–1850. By Sir CHARLES GAVAN DUFFY, K.C.M.G. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., London, Paris and New York. 1880.

"**Y**OUNG IRELAND" has certainly appeared at a time highly favourable to its chances of success. The interest taken in Irish affairs has become intense, and a certain similarity can be traced between the events of to-day and those described by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy. The remarkable and romantic career of the author, too, serves to stimulate the curiosity of the public; but, independently of these advantages, this book contains literary merit of too high an order, and historical matter of too great value, to allow of its being, under any circumstances, ignored or forgotten. It is written in a perfectly clear and unaffected style, and the earnestness of history is here and there enlivened by amusing anecdotes and witty *bon-mots*; so that the reader is borne on through the somewhat bulky volume without the sense of fatigue that too often accompanies the perusal of personal recollections. The following anecdote is an example of the author's happy powers of illustration:—

An Irish priest once asked a milkman, who admitted that he filled his pail occasionally from the pump, "How do you know, Michael, when to stop watering?" "Begorra, your reverence, we go on watering till the customers cry out agin it." This story supplies the rationale and justification of political agitation in Ireland—Parliaments and Governments go on blundering till the people cry out vigorously against it.

It is impossible to extract such gems from the setting without injury; as the appropriateness of the illustration and the sudden burst

of fun in the midst of serious thoughts add considerably to the amusement of the reader. In the vivid description of persons our author greatly excels; a few graphic touches and the man stands before us like a picture! Let us take for example the following piece of word-painting:—

The man most essentially a poet among the writers of the *Nation* was Clarence Mangan. He was as truly born to sing deathless songs as Keats or Shelley; but he lived and died in a provincialized city, and his voice was drowned for a time in the roar of popular clamour. He was so purely a poet that he shrank from all other exercise of his intellect. He cared nothing for political projects. He could never be induced to attend the weekly suppers, and knew many of his fellow-labourers only by name. He lived a secluded unwholesome life, and when he emerged into daylight he was dressed in a blue cloak, midsummer or midwinter, and a hat of fantastic shape, under which golden hair, as fine and silky as a woman's, hung in unkempt tangles, and deep blue eyes lighted a face as colourless as parchment. He looked like the spectre of some German romance rather than a living creature.

The present volume deals only with the earlier half of the decade, which will ultimately be included in this history. The second and concluding part is announced to be in preparation; and, the events of the second lustrum being so closely connected with those of the first as to form almost a continuous chain, we think it expedient to reserve an exhaustive Review of this important work until its publication shall have been completed. We must caution the reader that he will not find in "Young Ireland" a general history of the country during the years 1840–45. It is called "A Fragment," and its fragmentary character consists not only in its limitation to a single short epoch, but also in the exclusion of all but two of the many currents that make up the flood of history. The Repeal Agitation and the influence of the *Nation* are described so minutely, and brought into such prominence, that all other subjects of national interest either disappear or, at all events, are dwarfed into insignificance. We derive from Sir Charles G. Duffy's book no knowledge of the condition of the people, very little of the Parliamentary history of the period. The Reform of the Municipal Corporations in 1840; the Drainage Act of 1852, inaugurating practical legislation on the subject of waste lands; the Arms Act of 1843; the ever-burning Land Question, with its evictions and consequential outrages, receive little or no attention; and, still more remarkable, the crusade of Father Mathew against intemperance is only incidentally alluded to. We mention these omissions only to forewarn our readers that they must not expect to find in the "Fragment of History" a complete record of the country's affairs, but rather the development of the political aspirations of the Young Ireland party. The author, indeed, in his preface seems to disclaim the idea of completeness by asserting that his narrative is the history not of certain men, but of certain principles; and no one is better qualified than the first editor of the *Nation* to furnish us with a luminous treatise on the principles of Young Ireland.

The present instalment is mainly occupied with the Repeal Agita-

tion and its consequences; and this will be perused with avidity by politicians of to-day, attracted by the analogy it bears to the agitation now in progress. Nothing, however, is more striking to the impartial observer than the fundamental difference between the two. The one was a purely political movement, resting, at all events in part, on unselfish feelings of patriotism; the other is merely social, and has its mainspring in material discomfort. But the points of resemblance are more numerous if they are more superficial. The Repeal Agitation was not the voice of a people struggling to be heard, it did not originate with their discontent, but was created by the restless energy and persistent eloquence of a single leader. Week after week did O'Connell address himself to scanty audiences on Burgh Quay: still he did not withdraw discouraged from the contest. He presented his case to the Corporation of Dublin, and, after a three days' debate, succeeded in carrying his motion for a petition to Parliament in favour of Repeal. He organized monster meetings throughout the country; he established arbitration courts to supersede the ordinary tribunals; he received the offerings of the peasantry in the shape of "repeal rent;" his progress through the country was one unbroken ovation; and he ultimately succeeded in stirring to the depths the passionate feelings of the multitude. A higher class of recruits also began to join the movement after "Repeal" had received the sanction of the Corporation. The O'Connor Don, "lineal heir of the last Celtic king of Ireland," Lord Ffrench, the Bishops of Meath and Dromore, were enrolled as members of the association; and Archbishop M'Hale, "the Lion of the West," joined at the head of a hundred of his priests. Half a million of people stood round O'Connell at Tara; and still greater numbers would have mustered at Clontarf, but on the eve of the meeting the Government at length intervened, and in a high-handed fashion issued a prohibition. The meeting was not held, and shortly afterwards O'Connell and his lieutenants were arrested on the charge of seditious conspiracy. The history of that celebrated trial is probably familiar to all our readers; for an extremely interesting account of its most picturesque points we must refer them to Sir C. G. Duffy's pages. Though he was ultimately acquitted, O'Connell never recovered the humiliation of his imprisonment or the annoyance of his trial. The Repeal Movement passed into other hands, and soon threw off the semblance of Constitutional agitation. Although the efforts of O'Connell and those of the founders of the *Nation* were at first directed to the same end, yet their motives and arguments were essentially different. O'Connell was thoroughly loyal to the Crown, while he sought to destroy the Legislative Union and restore the Constitution of '82. The toast of "The Queen" was proposed and duly honoured at the Mullaghmast banquet, as it might have been at the Mansion House. He rested his case on the injury to commerce and manufacture that had resulted from the Union; and he assailed with bitter invective the means by which it had been effected. The brilliant knot of enthusiasts, on the contrary, who started the *Nation*, did so with the express purpose of developing a national feeling.

They were all under thirty, and filled with the uncalculating poetry of patriotism. They dreamed of an ideal past; they aspired to an impossible future. They cared nothing for the Crown, and England was to them only another name for a harsh and cruel mistress, who for centuries had stifled the yearnings of Ireland for individual growth. The mere material interests of the people were a secondary consideration in comparison with the elevation of Ireland to her place amongst the nations; and they sought, by their teaching, to propagate far and wide the transcendental patriotism which inspired their own minds. Still they worked with O'Connell for simple Repeal; and Sir Charles G. Duffy claims for the *Nation* no inconsiderable share in the awakening of the people.

The existence of these two currents of thought must be clearly apprehended by any one who wishes to understand the political history of this decade. The one, of which O'Connell was the incarnation, may be said to have abruptly perished in his fall; the other, though for a time subservient to his genius, outlived him, and developed naturally and logically into the more advanced opinions of the party of action which ended in the fiasco of Balingarry.

The Case of Ireland Stated. A Plea for my People and my Race.

By M. F. CUSACK. Dublin: Gill & Son. 1880.

THIS interesting contribution to the solution of the Irish difficulty arrived too late to be considered in our Article on that subject. Miss Cusack has put together a large amount of useful information. Her conviction, and her main reason for writing, is that the English people do not know the true state of Ireland. They do not read the Irish papers, and the English papers give, with few exceptions, only one side of the question. The work, which is over 400 pages, is mainly taken up with five subjects:—Irish land, Irish landlords, the agent system, the late "outrages," and the Irish clergy. On each of these matters Miss Cusack has something really useful to say. A large part of the book is made up of quotations, letters already published, and cuttings from newspapers. But it is convenient to have such materials in an accessible form. The writer brings out clearly—and this we take to be the most valuable part of the book—that the present system of letting land in Ireland is equivalent to "usury" on a gigantic scale. Whatever the legal protection of the tenant may amount to, practically, he has no freedom of contract; he must have land or starve; and he is, therefore, at the mercy of his landlord, who fixes the rent at what he thinks fit and raises it whenever he pleases. Now, as in all civilized countries it is considered a matter of public policy to discourage and put down "usury," as a pestilent plague which enriches a few and kills the very life of the community at large, so legislation must put a stop to the system of "usury" in Irish land. This we hold to be a sound view. We have already insisted upon it in the Article in our present number. Miss Cusack adds fresh evidence and new illustrations to its general truth. But there are other considerations which make the

demand for an Irish Land Law much more imperative than the mere statement of this economic principle would demand. There is the fact that in Ireland a large number of the landlords are absentees, and that consequently some £9,000,000 of the rents of Irish land is spent outside of the country. There is the fact that, in spite of the Land Act of 1870, 75 per cent. of the Irish farmers are liable to eviction *for non-payment of rent* at three months' notice, and that without any compensation for improvements. And there is the third fact, which in some respects is the most important of the three, that the authority of the absent landlord is exercised by an "agent" who has power to hurt, but none to help, whose duty is to gather and not to spend, and who has to administer a system and a set of "rules" instead of taking thought for the poor and promoting the well-being of men, women and children. All this is excellently brought out in the book before us. English sympathizers with Ireland—and there are more who both know and feel about Ireland than Miss Cusack seems to admit—would do well to go through its pages carefully, and to be prepared to state her case strongly when nonsense is talked about Communism, revolution and rebellion. Perhaps Miss Cusack does not speak with sufficient plainness about the undoubted facts of murder and outrage which have occurred. There is, no doubt, gross exaggeration. Over and over again, "outrages" have been reported in English papers and contradicted in Ireland immediately afterwards, and the contradictions have never found their way to the English side of the Channel. But even the contradictions which reach the English papers themselves should put us on our guard against accepting the reports of frightened "correspondents," and the imaginative narratives of the Royal Irish constables. But the evil deeds which have been done are shocking, if few; they are the indication of a much wider lawlessness than they express; and they are to a large extent sympathized in by the people in various parts of the country. These three truths cannot be denied. Sometimes it is lawful to palliate, at other times it is necessary to denounce the very same crimes. The time seems to have come to denounce the agrarian outrages, even whilst we do our best to acknowledge their source and to remove it. Of one thing we are convinced. Unless Mr. Parnell should separate the Irish people from their priests, lawlessness will continue to be merely sporadic and will be kept down. We are willing to leave the denunciation of the crime which too generally accompanies agitation to the action of the bishops and clergy of the land. They speak when it is necessary to speak.

The Apostle of Ireland and his Modern Critics. By W. B. MORRIS, Priest of the Oratory. With an Introductory Letter by AUBREY DE VERE. London: Burns and Oates. 1881.

IT is gratifying to find that the excellent Paper by Father Morris, of the Oratory, in our July number of the present year, has met with so much appreciation that he has reprinted it for general

circulation. The article was undertaken in order to establish the authenticity of the Records of St. Patrick, and to bring out the remarkable consistency which is in itself one of the strongest proofs of their authenticity. Father Morris admits that the Saint's first biographers have given prominence chiefly to his miracles, without attempting to portray his personal character; but he holds it to be quite clear that St. Patrick's character can be successfully brought out by the careful study of authentic materials. He takes his stand, therefore, against all who "divide" St. Patrick. There can be no personal devotion, he holds, to an undefined and shadowy hero of a myth. He is anxious, therefore, to prove the Apostle of Ireland, as represented in the Records which profess to refer to him, to be a real being of flesh and blood, "an angelic spirit tempered by the tenderness of a compassionate human heart."

Great interest is given to this new edition of an able study in hagiology, by the letter which Mr. Aubrey de Vere has addressed to the writer, and which is prefixed to the article itself. We wish we could quote the whole of the six pages of which it consists. Mr. de Vere, with his insight as a historian, a student and a poet, fully enters into Father Morris's argument from the "consistency" of the Records.

St. Patrick's character, as indicated in his writings, attests the authenticity of those historical documents which illustrate his life. That character was pre-eminently the *Apostolic* character in its marvellous union of heroism with humility, of the supernatural with the practical, of the soaring with the judicious—with sweetness, meekness, childlike innocence, and manly self-sacrifice (p. 4).

It would almost seem as if the writer of the "Legends of St. Patrick" was foreshadowing a new volume of moving word-pictures in the following lines:—

The day cannot be far distant when many a spot in Ireland will catch a new lustre reflected from Ireland's heavenly Patron. . . . The wilful disbelief of Milcho, and the glad belief of Dichu, which sprang from his good heart, will again be themes on the tongue of the peasant; and the boatman will point out where St. Patrick may have landed at Imber Dea, and later on the grassy shore of the great sea-lake not far from Downpatrick. Other youths will feel for the Saint the personal love which the youth Benignus felt, and tell how he carried the fawn down the woody steep of Armagh. The cry of the children in the wood of Foelut, the happy death of the two newly-baptized princesses, the strange interment of King Laeghaire, the baptism of Aengus at Cashel of the Kings, the feast of Knock Kae, the diverse fortune of the illiberal mother and the large-hearted son, King Eochardh's wonderful pact with the Saint—all these things will again, as of old, be the subject of popular discourse in the field, in the mountain, and at the fireside. But most often, surely, will be recounted the wonderful "Striving of St. Patrick on Mount Cruachan." . . . What a breadth and compass of character must have lain between the hardihood that sustained him week after week in that conflict, and the childlike tenderness of his anguish as it hung in suspense! For sublimity and for depth of significance it finds no parallel outside the inspired Scriptures (pp. 7, 8).

The Life of Henri-Marie Boudon, Archdeacon of Evreux. (Library of Religious Biography, edited by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON.) London: Burns & Oates. 1880.

THE real excellence, both of matter and style, that has marked the former volumes of Mr. Healy Thompson's series and made them deservedly popular, is quite sustained by the present addition to it. It is written in easy and idiomatic English, and its subject is the life of a man in whom busy and practical people of the present day can feel a real interest. It is the life of a man who has not been either canonized or beatified by the Church; who was not a monk because of the delicacy of his health, who was not a priest until he was thirty, because of his excessive humility. It is the life, too, of a man who was well-born and well-educated, who lived in the world and knew it—had witnessed both the good and the bad, the wealth and the poverty of it. The inference is, of course, not intended that cloistered saints, or saints of the most heroic and ascetic life do not contain a very useful, important, vital lesson to people of all classes and times. Quite the contrary: the story of their lives is likewise one for which we can all feel a deep interest. But treasures may lie untouched because not polished and set to present taste. To all intents and purposes the life of Henri-Marie Boudon is modern—it is not mediæval; it is a life in which incidents will directly portray the very scene and circumstance in which many readers will recognize their own need and read their own golden lesson. We welcome the book heartily; it is much superior to many of our translated biographies in style and tone, and very wisely adapted to the needs and special mental complexion of our own generation.

One reason, we are told in the Preface, which led to the publication of this biography, was the desire of bringing Boudon's writings before the notice of English Catholics. There has long been, in many minds, a supposition that some of his works were tainted with the errors of Quietism, and Mr. Thompson shows how this came about from the censure of an edition of one of his books that (as was the fate of some other books in those troublous times) had been tampered with and added to unknown to himself. The learning and genuine spirit of Catholic piety, as exhibited in Boudon's life, would be enough to raise a presumption against his unorthodoxy. Mr. Thompson has already made known to the English public three of Boudon's volumes, and he promises some more translations, which we trust, for the sake of that public, he may be enabled soon to publish. Any one who reads in these pages of Boudon's learning, profound wisdom, innocence of life, long and varied experience as a missionary and spiritual director, will need no further incitement to procure for themselves the works he has written. Space forbids any extracts or more particular account of this volume, but what has been said is only a moderate expression of the pleasure derived from a perusal of it, and will, we hope, send many to the volume itself. One point may attract some to it: Boudon's spiritual life was characterized by a tender devotion to the Providence of God, very much as St. Francis of Assisi's was to the virtue of

poverty. There is something of the seraph's own enthusiasm and poetry about Boudon's "Good Mistress and Mother Divine Providence." But the beautifully worded lessons of conformity to that Providence are most wonderfully illustrated in his own remarkable conduct in sufferings and trials. That these were not light, let it suffice to say, that from being Vicar-General, friend, and confidant of his Bishop, he came through the false representations, the calumnies and plots of his enemies, to lose (for a long time) that friendship and confidence, his office, the esteem of all good people; came, in fact, to such a point of general and unquestioned disrepute, that lay-sacristans of churches felt themselves free to refuse him vestments or an altar at which to say Mass, and that without a word of excuse—often with gratuitous insult. He not only bore all this, but rejoiced in it, and patiently withheld the words of self-justification that would have prevented it all. This is a great lesson to an age wrapped up in the conceit of self-worship; it is the apostolic lesson, too, of the "vivo, jam non ego." And the life shows also, what lends the lesson new persuasion, that Boudon did not trust to this Providence in vain; nor can any man. He accomplished all he undertook "in nomine Domini, qui fecit cælum et terram."

Irish Songs and Ballads. By ALFRED PERCIVAL GRAVES, author of "Songs of Killarney." Second edition. Manchester: Ireland & Co. 1880.

THIS is a pleasing collection of verses upon Irish subjects. The "Songs and Ballads" of which the first half of the book consists, are too persistently amatory, and, though quite inoffensive, they are somewhat monotonous. Verses of this kind soon grow uninteresting:—

The hour we parted
When broken-hearted,
You clung around me,
Maureen, aroo,
I swore I'd treasure,
Thro' pain and pleasure,
Thro' health and sickness,
My love for you. (P. 40).

Here is a fair specimen of the author's powers, in a humorous lyric:—

FATHER O'FLYNN.

Of priests we can offer a charmin' variety,
Far renowned for larnin' and piety;
Still, I'd advance ye widout impropriety,
Father O'Flynn as the flower of them all.

CHORUS.

Here's a health to you, Father O'Flynn,
Slainté, and slainté, and slainté agin;
Powerfulest preacher, and
Tinderest teacher, and
Kindest creature in culd Donegal.

Don't talk of your Provost and Fellows of Trinity,
 Famous for ever in Greek and Latinity,
 Faix and the divels and all at Divinity,
 Father O'Flynn 'd made hares of them all!
 Come, I venture to give ye my word,
 Never the likes of his logic was heard,
 Down from mythology
 Into Thayology
 Troth! and conchology if he'd the call.
 (*Chorus repeated.*)

Och! Father O'Flynn you've the wonderful way wid you,
 All ould sinners are wistful to pray wid you,
 All the young childer are wild for to play wid you,
 You've such a way wid you, Father avick!
 Still for all you've so gentle a soul,
 Gad, you've your flock in the grandest control;
 Checking the crazy ones,
 Coaxin' onaisy ones,
 Liftin' the lazy ones on wid the stick.
 (*Chorus repeated.*)

And though quite avoidin' all foolish frivolity,
 Still at all seasons of innocent jollity,
 Where was the play-boy could claim an equality
 At comicality, Father, wid you?
 Once the Bishop looked grave at your jest,
 Till this remark set him off wid the rest:
 "Is it lave gaiety
 All to the laity?
 Cannot the clargy be Irishmen too?"
 (*Chorus repeated.*) (P. 71.)

Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis secundum principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Ad usum scholasticum accommodavit, TILMANNUS PESCH, S. J. Friburgi: Herder. 1880.

THE exiled Fathers of the German province of the Society of Jesus have just issued the first volume of a work that deserves to be "aere perennius." It is dedicated to Blessed Albert the Great, who was the professor of St. Thomas in the Dominican convent at Cologne, where he died in 1280, and where his sacred remains are still preserved in a magnificent shrine in the parish church of St. Andrew—the district in which the old Dominican convent was formerly situated. As the Catholic Church keeps in the month of November, 1880, the sixth centenary of Blessed Albert's death, the author of this work, which is entirely occupied in developing and vindicating the principles propounded by the old philosophy, has very appropriately dedicated it to the memory of that man who was foremost in introducing into the schools the study of the works of Aristotle, and employing his wisdom in the service of Catholic science. Father Pesch's book is not only dedicated to Blessed Albert, but it quotes largely from his works, a fact the more worthy of notice since copies of his works are

now very rare, and a new, correct, and complete edition of them ought soon to appear.

The book we are noticing may be traced to the Holy Father's encyclical recommending the study of St. Thomas's original works; since every page amply testifies to the author's intimate acquaintance with the angel of the schools. The present volume will be followed by five others, treating of logic, psychology, metaphysics, morals, and the history of philosophy. We hope the fathers will ere long succeed in accomplishing this noble task; they will then have given the Catholic world the most exhaustive philosophical textbook of our time. The line taken by Father Pesch differs from the course commonly followed in schoolbooks. He begins with that part which is generally styled "*Cosmologia*," treating of the nature of corporeal substances. As the students of philosophy, according to the tradition handed down in Catholic schools, ought to start from the study of logic, Father Pesch could scarcely be defended were it not for the fact that the questions he so ably treats are especially suited to our epoch, when all interest seems to be monopolized by "natural" sciences, and deep dislike is felt for anything suggestive of another and a spiritual world.

The work consists of four books:—1. On the essence, nature, and principles of corporeal substances (pp. 74–374); 2. On their attributes (pp. 375–540); 3. On their origin and dissolution (pp. 541–694); 4. On the order and laws of Nature (pp. 695–725). Excellent indices and a synopsis of the whole work increase the facility of using it. A diligent perusal of the book leads me to point out two excellent qualities that mark it. The *manner* in which the all-important questions of this branch of study are grappled with is masterly. It is useless to look for a book written in a brilliant classical style; but what we have before us is a first-rate textbook. Going through it we were reminded of the great axiom—"Verum et ens convertuntur"; may we not justly propound the principle in this shape—"Verum et clarum convertuntur"? The author employs the scholastic method which claims preference to any other, as it stimulates the mind of youth, and trains it to answering an adversary's objections. Father Pesch embodies his doctrines in short and clear *theses*, which he immediately goes on to explain and vindicate. These theses amount to sixty-eight in number; and it seems to us that, owing to the very exhaustive treatment of the subject, Father Pesch's work could not be made use of in the ordinary courses of philosophy unless these come to be extended from one to three years. No professor, however, of philosophy or theology, wishing to do his work thoroughly, can afford to be without the book. The other quality we remark is the perfect knowledge the author shows of the physical sciences—in other words, he is perfectly acquainted with the enemy's position. Hence his work deserves especial attention and diligent study on the part of Catholic divines, both in Germany and England; for it cannot be denied that it is in these countries that so many modern literary men have encroached on the department of faith by outstepping the limits

of physical science, in which we are justified only in examining into manifest facts, but are not entitled to pass judgment on the constituents of corporeal substances. There is, perhaps, not one modern physicist who is not here dealt with; but it is to Mr. Darwin and his erroneous system that our author has paid especial attention. As every error is prolific of many other errors, so we see Mr. Darwin's system developed in the course of time into manifold kindred and equally unfounded theories. Hence, Father Pesch accurately distinguishes between Darwin's system (p. 71) and evolution (p. 623), between transmutation and the theory of descent, between the latter and transformation (p. 658). Amongst the modern German pseudo-philosophers who have opposed the true doctrine on the world's origin, Schopenhauer and Hartmann rank foremost. The first not only teaches the system of monism, but derives everything from a blind volition (panthelismus); while Hartmann exaggerates the scholastic doctrine of matter and form, and claims life and will for every corporeal substance. They are both refuted in a masterly manner by Father Pesch, who shows the origin of these modern sophists by tracing them to the Greek philosophers.

The space allowed to us renders it utterly impossible to point out the more positive theses of Father Pesch. But there is one point we wish to bring into due prominence—viz., his comments on the several systems dealing with the constituents of corporeal substances. He commences by discussing the nature of the *continuum*; this is made up of divisible parts, but "divisible" taken in a mathematical, not in a physical sense. Next, he proceeds to refute the atomistic and dynamical systems, and establishes the hylomorphical system held by St. Thomas, in defending the following theses:—"1st. The hylomorphical system in its principal tenets is absolutely certain; 2nd. It is likewise certain in its immediate consequences; 3rd. In the explanation of chemical changes, although it cannot be styled absolutely certain, it is nevertheless the best hypothesis; 4th. As to the facts on which it rests, the observations of modern physicists may be substituted for the less accurate observations of mediæval doctors" (p. 315). To the question whether or not, and how, the elements composing a new corporeal substance are continued in the latter, the writer answers that they are to be found in it "not *formaliter*, but only *virtualiter et radicaliter*." But whether all those opinions for which Father Pesch, in this part of the work, claims probability do really deserve that praise, we will not here express an opinion. Closely connected with theology are theses 48-52 (pp. 506-518), treating of the mode in which corporeal substances exist in space; and theses 64-68 (pp. 196, 726), commenting on necessary laws as regulating the course of Nature. Lastly, we may claim special attention for Father Pesch's dissertation on astrology. His thesis is embodied in the following words:—"Concerning astrology, it may reasonably be asserted, that the formation of the world, after the creation and formation of its 'materia,' was left to the agency of corporeal substances; hence the order of the world admits, in a certain sense, of a mechanical explanation" (p. 588).

The language in which Father Pesch has chosen to write, is, as we have said, the Latin. Whatever may be the arguments for modern idioms in our textbooks, it is a subject for congratulation that this very eminent one is in the language of the Catholic Church, and, by the fact, is at once at the disposal of cultivated readers of every nationality. B.

Historia S. P. Benedicti, a Ss. Pontificibus Romanis Gregorio I. descripta et Zacharia graecè reddita; nunc primum e codicibus saeculi VIII. Ambrosiano et Cryptensi-Vaticano edita et notis illustrata, cura JOSEPHI COZZA-LUZI, Abbatis Monachorum Basiliensium Cryptae-Ferratae et Bibliothecae Vaticanae Scriptoris. Tusculani: Typis Abbatiae Cryptae-Ferratae. 1880.

FATHER COZZA-LUZI, favourably known to the literary world as the editor of the "Codex Vaticanus sacrorum biblicorum graecus," has just published a precious book, worthy of the attention of every Catholic divine. It is a gift consecrated to S. Benedict on his fourteenth centenary. This fact accounts for only the second book of the dialogues being edited, as it expatiates on the miracles of the great patriarch S. Benedict. The effect of S. Gregory's dialogues during the Middle Ages was immense. But it was only in the eighth century that S. Zacharias, who governed the Church from 741 to 752, translated his predecessor's works into Greek. S. Zacharias was born in Southern Italy of Greek parents. When comparatively a young man he came to Rome, and was educated by the Benedictine monks, who were first driven out by Saracens from Monte Cassino, and then put in the Patriarchium of the Lateran by S. Gregory II. S. Zacharias' translation was largely used in the Oriental convents; but it claims a peculiar interest from having afforded many ideas to the great abbot S. Nilus, who celebrated S. Benedict in his immortal Greek hymns. S. Nilus, as founder and first abbot of Grotta Ferrata, ordered a special office of S. Benedict to be said. Hence the friendship and intimate connection which for centuries bound the two remarkable convents, Grotta Ferrata and Monte Cassino. S. Zacharias must have been an eminent Greek scholar. Whoever goes through his translation will easily agree that it breathes the genius of the Greek language perhaps in a higher degree than the Latin employed by S. Gregory approaches to the classic idioms of the Augustan period. But be this as it may, the special interest claimed by Father Cozza-Luzi's work is derived from its critical and palaeographical importance. Both for the Latin and Greek texts of the dialogues he examined and employed the oldest existing codices—the Latin codex belonging to the Ambrosian Library, Milan, and the Greek belonging to the Vatican Library. The latter, having been written in the year 800, ranks amongst the oldest Greek manuscripts we at present possess, and belongs to that small class of Greek codices which bear a certain date anterior to the tenth century. The edition is accompanied by a learned introduction, commenting on

the codices, contents, and importance of the second book of the dialogues; besides, we are presented with a facsimile of the Latin and Greek codex.

In bringing Father Cozza-Luzi's work before the public, we venture to indulge the hope that it may ere long find a place in every great Catholic library. Would it not form an excellent text-book for Greek lessons in Catholic schools? B.

Messianic Prophecies. Lectures by G. FRANZ DELITZSCH, Professor of Theology, Leipzig. Translated from the MS. by S. J. Curtiss, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1880.

THIS is a book of 119 pages, translated from the MS. notes of lectures delivered by the veteran orientalist Delitzsch, in the University of Leipsic. We need scarcely say that any one who merely reads this little book through without previous study of the subject, will finish the persual as wise and no wiser than he was when he began it. With the student who has already given some attention to the prophetic writings it will be very different. He will find here a most admirable summary of the results attained by ancient and modern research, an invaluable help to memory when he wishes to recall what the prophets have said of the Messiah, and how others have interpreted the prophets. We have seen no other book in German or in English which can at all compete with the little work before us, in this respect. Nor is this all, or nearly all. At every turn we meet with original and suggestive remarks. Even the grammatical and philological side of the Messianic prophecies is carefully treated, and it is really wonderful that means should have been found of compressing so much matter into so small a space. In some ways, we think, Delitzsch gains by the limits which the nature of his work has imposed upon him. His commentaries, with all their undoubted excellencies, are often diffuse and disfigured by fanciful sentiment, which distracts the reader's attention from the real points of the question. The former of these faults is altogether, the latter nearly altogether, avoided in the Lectures. We cannot of course tell with certainty how far the English translation is an exact reflection of the original, for the German is not published; but the English is on the whole clear and good, nor are there many misprints, either in the Hebrew or in the Greek and English words. On p. 24, ἱπταμοι in the quotation from Epiptanius seems to be put by error for ἀπτομαι, and on p. 90, the third year of Cyrus is given as 555 instead of 535.

We cannot pretend to analyze the contents of a book which is itself a brief compendium, but we may call attention to some of its special excellencies. The Lectures open with an account of the prophetic office—and a most instructive contrast is drawn between the prophets of the true God and the soothsayers of heathen religions. With the latter the prediction of the future was all in all; they considered every means permissible. They tried to hold communion with the spirits

of the dead and with demons. They forced themselves into a state of ecstasy by the use of narcotics, or else worked themselves up into an excitement which bordered upon madness. The prophets, on the other hand, drew near to God and waited patiently for his voice. Hence—*i.e.*, from the very fact that they were the friends of God—their office was a much nobler and higher one than mere prediction. "Hath the Lord done anything?" Amos says, "and has he not revealed his counsel to his servants the prophets?" They saw God's purposes unveiled before their eyes, in his past dealings with the chosen people and with all nations. They supplied the place of preachers, for there was no preaching in the temple. They kept alive the spirit of the law and prevented it from degenerating in the hearts of the people into a dead formalism. They proclaimed the inefficiency of the Mosaic Law and pointed to that "new covenant which was destined to replace it." Lastly, although it was a principal, indeed the principal, part of their office, to unveil the future, in doing so they sought a far higher end than the gratification of natural curiosity. The whole religion of the Jewish people was a religion of expectation. All that they cherished most was to perish, but only that a higher order might replace the old. "Destruction, destruction, destruction will I bring upon it (*i.e.* on the Jewish crown) until He comes to whom the government belongs and [to him] will I give it (Ezech. xxi. 32, in the Hebrew text).

After explaining the nature of the prophetic office, the lectures proceed to trace the gradual development of Messianic prophecy. We cannot have an intelligent, not to speak of a scientific, knowledge of prophecy, till we understand that the Messianic ideas were not given at once in their fulness but were gradually enlarged, and perfected, by the direct action of God's spirit on the one hand, and by the course of His providence on the other. God spoke to the "Fathers by the prophets, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*," "in many portions and in many ways:" *i.e.*, the prophets had certain portions and aspects of the truth conveyed to them, and this in a manner and under images adapted to their own times and to their own characters. In the lectures, this history of the Messianic expectation is set forth with great power and clearness. On the whole matter we must refer the reader to the lectures themselves, but we will mention two points in this history, as Delitzsch gives it, which strike us as specially important.

First then, whereas the energy of the heathen oracles, and indeed of the heathen religions generally, grew with the growth of the national spirit and decayed with its decay, the very opposite of this holds good of Hebrew prophets. National disasters, nay, what seemed an annihilation of the people under the Assyrians, did but purify and strengthen the belief in the Messiah. Even the personal imperfections and consciousness of human weaknesses in the prophet, did the same work. Thus, in many psalms David scarcely seems to distinguish himself, the "anointed of the Lord," from the Christ, whose type he was. But after his double sin, into which he had fallen when at the height of his glory, he makes a sharp distinction between his own person and that of Christ, and in Psalm cx. (Dixit

dominus domino meo) "he bows as if he had descended from his throne, before the Christ of God, as his Lord." Again, on his death-bed, "he grasps the pillars of the promise," he asserts his faith in "the eternal covenant" with his house, and looks forward to "a ruler of men, a just one, a ruler in the fear of God" (2 Sam. xxiii. 1-9). Next, the supernatural, we had almost said the Christian, characteristics of Hebrew prophecy are wonderfully illustrated by the account of the "servant of the Lord" in the latter part of Isaiah. As a rule the prophets insist on the insufficiency of sacrifice. But the "servant of the Lord" pours out his soul as "a trespass-offering," and atones for the sins of the people. The prophet finds the true explanation of the sacrificial rites in Him, "who is the true realization of all sacrifice."

We have one remark to make in conclusion. There is scarcely anything in these lectures to which a Catholic need object, but in one respect they are incomplete. The prophets speak not only of Christ, but of Christ's Church, though Delitzsch, like other Protestants, seems blind to this fact. Yet we venture to say, that there is not a single prophecy of Christ's passion more distinct than that of the Mass in Malachias: "For from the rising of the sun even to its going down, great is my name among the heathen, and in every place incense is offered to my name, a pure meal-offering (*i.e.*, an offering of flour, as distinct from the sacrifice of animals), for great is my name among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." The prophet emphasizes the fact that sacrifice is to be offered "*in every place.*" He cannot have meant, as Hitzig thinks, that the heathen sacrifices were acceptable to God, because such an idea is utterly opposed to the whole spirit of the prophet; nor can he have simply meant to say that prayer was to be offered everywhere, for there would have been nothing remarkable in this, and in fact for centuries before the prophet's time Jews had prayed to the true God in distant parts of the earth. The whole context shows that the prophet is contrasting the sacrifices offered in one place—viz., the temple—with the "clean oblation" offered all over the world which was to replace them. A further argument may be drawn from our Lord's words to the Samaritan woman, John iv. 23; nor is the prophecy of the Mass in Ps. cx. "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec," less striking. Melchisedec was, as every believer in the New Testament must acknowledge, a type of Christ. The Psalm points out one point of the resemblance between type and antitype. Melchisedec foreshadowed Christ, because he (Melchisedec) was at once priest and king, and because Melchisedec's offering of bread and wine, prefigured that perpetual oblation of Himself which Christ was to make under the forms of bread and wine. We can imagine only one other interpretation in any way plausible. Some of the most extreme adherents of the negative school (*e.g.*, Hitzig and Olshausen) refer the words to the Maccabean princes who were both priests and kings. But even to this explanation there are two objections, one of them overwhelming, the other very strong. The Maccabean princes were priests by natural descent, and in no sense "priests after the order of Melchisedec." Next, the historical

reasons against referring any part of the Psalter to the Maccabean period, appear convincing, not only to Delitzsch himself, but even to pronounced rationalists such of Hupfeld.

W. E. ADDIS.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. External Evidences. By EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

THERE is nothing very original in Dr. Abbott's book, which is a defence of the Johannic authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But he gives an account of the literature of the controversy which is very clear, and which embraces the very latest books which have appeared in Germany. Dr. Abbot writes with full knowledge of his subject; he is clear and logical, and he writes with great moderation and with uniform courtesy to his opponents. We think it is a pity he attaches so much importance to the book called "Supernatural Religion." It has been long since demolished by Dr. Lightfoot, and will probably soon be forgotten. One point Dr. Abbot brings out very forcibly. Those who deny the authenticity of St. John's Gospel have been forced to place its composition at a very early date. Keim, for example, placed it, in the last volume of his "History of Jesus," at about 130, and the quotations from St. John's Gospel in Justin Martyr make it impossible to put it much later. Now it is the uniform tradition, Dr. Abbot writes, "supported by great weight of testimony, that the evangelist John lived to a very advanced age, spending the latter portion of his life in Asia Minor, and dying there in the reign of Trajan, not far from 100. How could a spurious gospel of a character so peculiar, so different from the early synoptic gospels, so utterly unhistorical as it is affirmed to be, gain currency as the work of the apostle, both among Christians and Gnostic heretics, if it originated only twenty-five or thirty years after his death, when so many, who must have known whether he wrote such a work or not, were still living?" This is a question more easily asked than answered.

W. E. ADDIS.

The Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God. By Sister MARY FRANCES CLARE. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: Gill & Son. 1880.

LIKE the authoress of this fluent and pious, but very redundant, Life of our Lady, we feel that some apology is necessary for its production. It is very long—it was not to be expected that it should contain anything new in regard to our Lady's life—and it is both tiresome and inaccurate. Its tiresomeness arises from its excessively wordy style, its "preaching" tone, its commonplace eloquence, and its continual repetitions. There is, besides, a strain of false sentiment, which may perhaps be considered piety by some, but will assuredly repel more than it attracts. As for its inaccuracy, we

will content ourselves with giving a single example. The writer is speaking of the mystery of our Lord's circumcision. She states that, according to tradition, our Blessed Saviour wept. She continues,—“Alas! did He then foresee all the sin which even this suffering would be powerless to avert? . . . Did He foresee the millions who, &c.? . . . *We may but conjecture.*” Now some would call this expression of uncertainty as to our Lord's omniscience by a harder name than inaccuracy; but with the authoress it seems to be nothing more, for in the very same passage she has these curious sentences:—“Did He weep, knowing all things as God, and as man feeling pain, as a little child would do? Did He, knowing all things as God, foresee the millions who should wilfully neglect,” &c. (pp. 445-6). She states in these words that He knew all things as God; but leaves it quite doubtful, as far as words go, that He knew also *as man* all that was, that had been, and that was to be.

Other examples of inaccuracy could easily be given. It is a pity that so much labour should have been spent in our Lady's honour, and that competent literary and theological assistance should not have been secured to make the work less unsatisfactory.

Outlines of the History of Religion to the Spread of the Universal Religion.

By C. P. TIELE, Dr. of Theology, Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Leiden. Translated from the Dutch by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A. Second Edition. London: Trübner. 1880.

IT is not very easy for a Catholic writer to criticize satisfactorily such a book as this of Dr. Tiele's, because while its learning, its candour, its clearness, merit great praise, the author's point of view is altogether alien from ours. He writes of the religions of the world in the spirit in which a Pagan philosopher might have written; and of course we know that in such a spirit only one side of truth, and indeed only a portion of that one side, can be discerned. We know, too, that partial truth is often whole error. The propositions that “all the truths of religion flow from the natural force of human reason,” and that “the prophecies and miracles recorded and narrated in Scripture are poetical fictions,” are, as we Catholics are assured upon sufficient authority, false. But these are the main propositions, as we judge, wherewith Dr. Tiele sets out. Hence his book is radically unsound. Still the Catholic student who has any just occasion to consult the work, and who bears this in mind, may learn much from it. The author's object is, as he tells us in his preface, to give us “outlines, pencil-sketches, nothing more,” of the history of religion until the spread of what he calls “universal religions:” that is to say, until Buddhism diffused itself in Eastern Asia, Islam in Western, and Christianity in the Roman Empire.

There is great danger [he writes] that so young a science [as the science of Religions] may lose itself in abstract speculations, based on a few facts and a great many dubious or erroneous statements, or not based on any facts at all. For the philosopher who wishes

to avoid this danger, for the theologian who desires to compare Mosaism and Christianity with the other religions of the world, for the specialist who devotes all his labours and all his time to one single department of this vast science, for him who studies the history of civilization—none of whom have leisure to go to the sources themselves, even for him who intends to do so, but to whom the way is as yet unknown, a general survey of the whole subject is needed, to serve as a kind of guide or travelling-book on their journey through the immense fairyland of human faith and hope. My book is an attempt to supply what they want. In a short paragraph-style I have written down my conclusions, derived partly from the sources themselves, partly (for no man can be at home everywhere) from the study of what seemed to me the best authorities; and I have added some explanatory remarks and bibliographical notices on the literature of the subject—very short where such notices could easily be found elsewhere, more extensive and as complete as possible where nothing of the kind, so far as I knew, yet existed (Preface, p. viii.).

So much may suffice to indicate the scope and spirit of this work. The bibliographical portion of it seems to us to be the most valuable. In making this remark we are far from intending any disparagement of the learned author. Indeed, we think that he would agree with it, for often and strongly as we are obliged to differ from him, we bear ungrudging testimony that his learning is only equalled by his modesty.

Monarchy and Democracy: Phases of Modern Politics. By the Duke of SOMERSET, K.G. London: J. Bain.

IN this little volume the Duke of Somerset gives the world, through a series of short essays, his views upon some of the principal political topics of the day, such as "Constitutional Sovereignty," "Modern Democracy," "the Functions of Government," "Liberty," and "Progress." The ostensible object of the work, indeed, is not to set forth the noble author's own opinions, but to test, by later experience, certain doctrines proposed by distinguished French, English, and American writers, and to compare their predictions with subsequent events. The Duke of Somerset's own conclusions on the various subjects which he passes under review are, however, not obscurely indicated. They are not hopeful conclusions; but, as we must frankly admit, they are, for the most part, only too well founded. The great fact of the age is the advance made everywhere by the movement which found its most perfect experience in the French Revolution of the last century; and, as the Duke of Somerset clearly discerns, the tendencies of that movement are not in the direction of rational liberty or durable peace, or any true progress of the human race. But what he does not discern is that the essential principle of the Revolution, its radical vice, is its atheism; the elimination of the idea of God from the public order and the substitution of the idea of man in His place. This is clearly expressed in the "*Catéchisme Populaire Révolutionnaire*," published by the Commune for general instruction, where we are taught "*qu'il n'y a pas de puissance et de justice au-dessus et en dehors de l'homme et que nier Dieu c'est*

affirmer l'homme unique et véritable Souverain de ses destinées." But we are afraid that the Duke of Somerset is little more disposed to acknowledge God than the Communists themselves. Still his little work, as far as it goes, is very telling, and is likely to have quite an enlightening effect upon many readers.

Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle. Compiled by EDWIN WALLACE, M.A. Parker & Co. 1880.

IN the compass of seventy octavo pages, Mr. Wallace has succeeded in giving us the cream of Aristotle. He has put the Stagyrte into a nutshell. An introduction of six pages gives a miniature history of the philosopher, of his works, and of their influence in ancient and modern times, and some brief but satisfying remarks on their genuineness and arrangement. Then follow six chapters, exhibiting in a series of compact little sections, each supported by well-chosen extracts from the original texts, the leading doctrines of Aristotle on logic, metaphysics, the philosophy of Nature, psychology, moral and political philosophy, and the philosophy of art. Finally, an index of Greek terms warns us that the book is intended chiefly for those who can read the philosopher in his own tongue.

This description will sufficiently recommend the work to philosophical students. To Catholics, especially, the "ipsissima verba" of the man who laid the foundations of the Scholastic Philosophy must always be of great interest and value; and they who have not the leisure to peruse his works in their integrity, will find a good substitute in these faithfully drawn outlines.

The Story of Philosophy. By ASTON LEIGH. Trübner & Co. 1881.

WE are tempted to call this book "The Ancient Philosophers in the Magic Lantern." It is eminently pictorial, and there is about the pictures an unnatural brightness, a vividness of colour that reminds us of the oxy-hydrogen. The author invites us to behold the sages of ancient Greece, passing before us in visionary procession, like the kings in *Macbeth*; Thales, the father of philosophy, "the old man with the flowing beard, and kindly face," Pythagoras, "a lofty figure with folded arms and regal head," the weeping Heraclitus, Democritus the laughter-loving, and so on till the airy pageant closes with the celebrities, such as they are, of the New Academy. Socrates and Plato are evidently the author's favourites, and he exhibits them and their surroundings with minute care, and, we must add, with great felicity. He brings before us, with captivating brilliancy, ancient Athens, with its transparent atmosphere, its golden sunshine, and its sparkling marble, its magnificent public edifices, and its shabby dwelling-houses; the physical and intellectual beauty of its people, and, withal, the odour of unspeakable corruption that hung about it and them. The personal characteristics of his philosophical heroes are portrayed with not less success. Socrates, especially, seems to live before our gaze, as we follow him from scene to scene, and listen to

him, now engaged in one of those intellectual contests which Plato has immortalized in his Dialogues, now pronouncing his noble Apology before his judges, now discoursing calmly of immortality on the brink of the tomb.

The doctrines are not described so well as the men. The chief points only are stated, and in a broad, popular fashion, so that one who runs may read, but, in the main, as correctly as such conditions permit. On page twenty-eight, however, the author seems to defend, or at least, apologize for Hegel's bewildering statement, that being and not-being are one and the same; and at page thirty-two, after describing the Atheistic atomism of Democritus, he asserts that Leibnitz held opinions almost exactly similar. Scripture texts are introduced here and there in new and, to our mind, somewhat incongruous connections. Taking it altogether, the book is pleasant reading, and will be, no doubt, acceptable to such as would be glad to learn something, without much trouble, of the wisdom and of the follies of the ancient philosophers.

The Student's Handbook of British and American Literature. By the Rev. O. L. JENKINS, A.M. Edited by a Member of the Society of St. Sulpice. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1880.

THIS is a substantial octavo volume of some 500 pages, well printed, well bound, and of very moderate price. The Rev. Mr. Jenkins has conferred a decided benefit on our Catholic colleges and schools by publishing this book, which is meant to be a manual for the more advanced classes in our educational establishments.

The work is divided into two parts, and each part sub-divided into periods. The first part comprises British literature, and is divided into five periods—the old Saxon or Anglo-Saxon period, from 449 to 1066; the semi-Saxon, or transition period, from 1066 to 1250; the old English, or early English period, from 1250 to 1350; the middle English period, from 1350 to 1580; and the modern English period, from 1580 to 1880.

Part II. comprises American literature. This part is divided into three periods—the colonial era, from 1607 to 1761; the Revolutionary period, from 1761 to 1800; and the present century.

The plan of the book is to give a history of literature, according to each period, and of the men who have contributed in the most striking way to the development and perfection of the language. Such selections are made from the best writers as the author thinks are calculated to awaken and improve the student's literary taste.

A special feature of the book is that it was composed for Catholic students, and hence the author has taken particular care, especially in this new edition, to point out the danger to which the reading of some authors exposes them. He rightly observes in his preface to the book that, "Catholic authors are generally ignored or sneeringly slighted by Protestant textbooks of literature," and this he considers

a special reason why *he* should not neglect them. We are pleased, therefore, to find that he gives, in their places, a short notice of the most remarkable of our Catholic modern authors. But we are at a loss to account for the omission of certain names which are an honour not only to Catholic, but to English literature in general. We are sorry to find forgotten, for instance, Kenelm Digby, the erudite and graceful author of "*Mores Catholici*," the "*Comptum*," and other works; Dr. Ward, one of the most clear and powerful writers of our day; Father Harper, a cultured writer and profound thinker; Father Dalgairns, and some others. We hope this defect will be remedied in a future edition.

Vie de Frédéric Ozanam, Professeur de littérature étrangère à la Sorbonne.

Par son frère, C. A. OZANAM, Chapelain d'honneur de sa Sainteté, Missionnaire Apostolique, &c.

Le Vicomte Armand de Melun, d'après ses Mémoires et sa Correspondence. Par M. l'Abbé BAUNARD, chanoine honoraire d'Orléans, &c. 8vo. Paris: Poussielgue.

WE have included in the same notice the biographies of two distinguished Frenchmen who served the same holy cause with equal devotedness, and whose names will live so long as there remains here below any love for what is true and noble and just. A time must come when the history of the Church during the nineteenth century will have to be written, and one of the most interesting chapters in that history cannot but be the one describing the efforts made by France to shake off the trammels of theological Gallicanism, and to claim complete freedom of action for Christian thought, Christian philanthropy, and Christian education. Lacordaire, Montalembert, Gerbet, Gratry, Ravignan are, of course, the best known amongst the representatives of that movement; but the group of Catholics who frequented the *salon* of Madame Swetchine, and there discussed the ever-important question of the *entente cordiale* between faith and reason, included also the subjects of the two volumes we have now to notice—Count de Melun and Frédéric Ozanam.

We can quite understand and we thoroughly respect the feeling which prompted M. l'Abbé Ozanam to crowd the pages of his book with all the materials calculated to illustrate the early years and rich promise of his gifted brother; but he has forgotten, we think, that such relics are not likely to interest the general public, and from the point of view of mere artistic composition, they should have either been suppressed altogether, or at any rate considerably curtailed, and given at the end of the volume in the shape of an appendix. The biographical notice of Ozanam, the mathematician, is also a *hors d'œuvre*, interesting no doubt, but out of proportion with the rest of the work. Having thus done the disagreeable part of the critic's duty, we can now all the more heartily recommend M. l'Abbé Ozanam's volume as an excellent contribution to what we have no hesitation in calling the modern *acta sanctorum*.

It is curious to observe the early manifestations of all the great qualities which were in after-life to distinguish the brilliant successor of M. Fauriel at the Sorbonne, the eloquent and at the same time learned author of "*Dante et les philosophes Catholiques au XIII^e siècle*;" no one ever showed in a greater degree the happy union between the thoroughly practical view of life and the intellectual aspirations which too often adopt as their motto, if not *odi*, at any rate *sperno profanum vulgus*; in this respect he stood out in perfect contrast to the philosophic Ampère, with whom he had the good fortune of being intimately acquainted, and who was undoubtedly the man the least fitted for the duties of society. Faith was their common ground, and Ampère found in Ozanam's soul a ready and enthusiastic response when, one day, after meditating for a long time on the wonderful works of God, he buried his head within his hands, and exclaimed: "*Oh! que Dieu est grand, Ozanam, que Dieu est grand!*"

The young student had started in life with the firm intention of showing to those around him that a man may be at once a Christian and yet gifted with common sense; such were his own words, and he completely acted up to them. His first appearance as a public character was at Lyons, his native town, in a controversy with the Saint-Simonians who had attempted to proselytize the working classes, and to spread their new doctrines on political economy. The events of July, 1830, had brought the French Revolution one stage forward in its fatal career, and the wild theories of Enfantin, Cabet, with Louis Blanc and Fourier were preparing the way slowly but surely for the social dreams of Auguste Comte, Prud'homme and M. Littré. It was at the same time that Frédéric Ozanam, with the genuine ardour which knows no impossibilities, sketched the plan of a gigantic work destined never to be carried out, but portions of which were transferred to his lectures and his essays. None but a young man could have dreamt of raising to Christianity a monument supposing, on the part of its author, a complete knowledge of ethnology, metaphysics, philology, history, geography, natural philosophy, in fact, *omnium rerum scibilium*. The programme of this vast conception will be found in the Abbé Ozanam's volume (pp. 125-129); it is worth reading.

We do not mean to trace, step by step, our hero's career: suffice it to say that, in his capacity of lecturer, at Lyons first, and then in Paris, he obtained the most brilliant and deserved success. His biography illustrates very well the attitude assumed by the University of France towards Catholic teaching; when we consider the lamentable *fiasco* in which the rationalism of the late Victor Cousin and his school has ended, we see one more proof that there cannot be two paths towards the attainment of truth, and that, as Maine de Brian strikingly said, "*La religion résoud seule les problèmes que la philosophie pose*;" but this truism was not universally recognized forty years ago, and the *jeune France* of those days sincerely believed that the spiritualized doctrines of Damison, Jouffroy, Rémusat, and Cousin were all the stronger because they had shaken off the yoke of Christianity. How utterly wrong such an hypothesis must ever be is now plainly apparent to all unprejudiced minds.

The other event with which Frédéric Ozanam's name will ever remain associated is the establishment and progress of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Socialists of every hue, Fourierists, Positivists, Communists, could not but fail in their endeavours to settle the momentous problem of pauperism, for the simple reason that their starting-point was essentially wrong; by taking up their position at the foot of the Cross, Ozanam and his noble-minded coadjutors saw at once the real solution of the difficulty, and the success they immediately obtained proves that they alone had discovered the right track. All our readers know with what jealousy the government of Napoleon III. watched the development of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and endeavoured to transform it into a means of political influence. The whole history of this episode is given in detail by the Abbé Ozanam in his excellent volume.

If we now turn to the life of Viscount Armand de Melun, we find ourselves still face to face with the problems of pauperism, of Catholic charity, and of the relations between capital and labour; but it is a politician whom we have to consider, a man constantly engaged on the battle-field of parliamentary discussions, and called upon to hoist the banner of Christianity amidst antagonists who aimed at working out in the sphere of *practical* government the revolutionary principles of which Ozanam's opponents sought to realize the *intellectual* consequences. As a work of art, the Abbé Baunard's volume is infinitely superior to the one we have just been noticing, and although the author had his materials ready prepared for him, so to say, in the shape of memoirs, letters, speeches, and documents of every kind, yet a considerable amount of taste and of discrimination is always needed in putting together documents which were not originally meant for publication, and in this respect the Abbé Baunard has been quite successful.

Born in 1807, Viscount de Melun was six years older than Frédéric Ozanam, yet he survived him, and after having witnessed the third exile of the Bourbon family, he lived long enough to see, not the fall of a royal house, but the very foundations of society threatened with destruction during the horrors of the Commune. In a book where every chapter is full of interest, it is difficult to select one for special consideration, and therefore we shall content ourselves with remarking on two or three points which seem to us landmarks in the life of Viscount de Melun. The description of the fatal errors which sealed the fate of Charles X. is extremely curious, and we are led to wonder how even the popularity obtained by the King during his excursion of 1826 through the provinces of eastern and northern France could have blinded him as to the state of public opinion. The famous decree of July 26, 1830, had hardly been signed when the Cardinal de Rohan, in the midst of the universal fermentation, persisted in looking upon Prince de Polignac as the best friend of the dynasty, and the sight of the tricolour flag waving from the top of Notre Dame scarcely woke him out of his dream.

Thus having received his earliest political training, so to say,

amidst the Paris barricades, Viscount de Melun was for some time hesitating as to the best way of spending his activity, when he became acquainted with Madame Swetchine. This gifted lady soon discovered the high qualities he possessed, his love of truth, his practical mind, and the common sense with which he viewed the important questions then occupying the attention and awakening the anxiety of all genuine patriots. Her influence had proved of the most beneficial kind for his intellectual progress, it acted likewise upon his heart, and determined his career for the future.

"As for me, dear friend," said he in a letter to Madame Swetchine, "I have no longer any doubt with respect to my vocation. I have struggled against science, I have argued all the great questions of philosophy, I have had my days of thought and of speaking. But since the longing for action has taken possession of me, my only aim is to render that action more fruitful and holier, without feeling anxious as to the employment of my time and of the future."

"This action was thoroughly reasoned out; prompted by philosophy and faith rather than by instinct and inclination, it was inspired by three principles which reveal the whole thought, animate the whole conduct, and direct the whole life of M. de Melun. These three principles are the following. 1. Society can be saved only by charity. 2. Charity should take up its position independently of politics, and derive its inspiration from religion alone. 3. Religion itself can be all-important only with the help of liberty."

This quotation, which we borrow from the Abbé Baunard's work, illustrates admirably the whole course of Viscount de Melun's life, and furnishes the key to his political views. Armed with the critical acumen which nothing can give but a familiar acquaintance with revealed truth, he appreciated most accurately the wild theories preached by Lamennais and Pierre Leroux, exposing their hollowness, and showing that the Gospel alone realizes the notion of fraternity. Both in his autobiography and in his correspondence we have noted a number of passages which should be attentively weighed by those whose duty will be to write the history of France between 1848 and the present day.

The designation of *Législateur de la Charité* has often been applied to Viscount de Melun; it could not be more justly given, and the enumeration of all the works in which he was engaged and the charitable societies to which he belonged would astonish those who do not know how much can be accomplished with the help of method, regularity, perseverance, and especially *Christian faith*. Thus occupying in the political world a position which gave him influence of the weightiest character, Viscount de Melun was brought into contact with Louis Napoleon, who, in 1850, was aspiring to the presidency of the French Republic. The chapters xiii. to xviii., treating of the imperial régime, are amongst the most interesting in the book, on account of the light they throw upon the policy of a despot, who, after endeavouring to secure the immediate enjoyment of power by the support of *respectable* men such as Count de Falloux and the leading members of the Right

in the National Assembly, threw them overboard as soon as his object was accomplished, and sent them to prison on the day of the *coup d'état*. The policy of Napoleon III. with the Holy See, the occupation of Rome, the Vatican Council, the Syllabus, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, all come in for their due share of notice, and in many instances Viscount de Melun's narrative supplements usefully the details given by the Abbé Ozanam. In conclusion, we have seldom read two works which we can more cordially recommend than those we have just been reviewing; and we feel no doubt that they will soon obtain the amount of popularity they so thoroughly deserve.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

De la Certitude Morale. PAR LEON OLLÉ-LAPRUNE. 1 vol. 8vo.
Paris: Eugene Belin. 1880.

BY moral certitude, M. Ollé-Laprune would denote, not merely that lowest degree of certitude which just rises above probability, but certitude of whatever degree, applied to moral truth. Moral truths he reduces to four cardinal points—the moral law, moral liberty, the existence of God, and the future life; and his chief object is to determine the sources whence this moral certitude is derived.

In his first chapter he explains that moral certitude is both real and rational, practical, and speculative. In the second he shows that the will does not itself judge, as Descartes erroneously taught, but that it has an immense influence on our judgments of all matters not immediately evident, and especially in truths of the moral order. Next he explains that the great moral truths are known to us partly by proof of reason, partly by belief; that there is great danger to both reason and belief in disturbing the equilibrium between them; and that those writers who have exaggerated the influence of faith—he would call them *fideists*—have sown the seeds of scepticism and positivism. Finally, having shown that moral certitude contains a large subjective element, he proves the objective validity of moral truth.

In making our way through this volume we sadly miss the richness of illustration with which the same or cognate subjects are treated in the "Grammar of Assent." Still, it is written clearly, and with a certain vivacity of style; it treats of questions of the highest interest now-a-days to philosophers and to theologians; and it possesses an additional attraction for English readers, from the fact that it exhibits the views held on these questions by the leaders of English Thought—by Cardinal Newman on the one side, and on the other by Hamilton, Mansel, Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, and Bain.